

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Bryan Martyn
Executive Director



Board Members

Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail, *Chair*
Maria Baier, State Land Commissioner, *Vice Chair*
Kay Daggett, Sierra Vista
Alan Everett, Sedona
Larry Landry, Phoenix
William C. Scalzo, Phoenix
Tracey Westerhausen, Phoenix

**Minutes OF PUBLIC MEETING
Of
THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP
(OHVAG)
Of
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD**

Notice is hereby given pursuant to A.R.S. §41-511.22 to members of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) and the general public that the Group will hold a meeting open to the public on **Friday, August 10, 2012 beginning at 11:00 a.m. at the Arizona State Parks Board Room, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.** Public comment will be taken.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL – 11:05 am

In attendance:

Chair, John Savino

Don French, White Mountain Open Trail Association

Thomas McArthur, Coconino Trail Riders

David Moore, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation

Pete Pfeifer, American Motorcycle Association

Chair, John Savino addressed the Group:

Ok, we have a Quorum and we will continue.

1. OHVAG Chair (or designee) will read mission statement:

The Statewide OHV Program Mission statement is to develop and enhance statewide off-highway vehicle recreation opportunities, and develop the educational programs that promote resource protection, social responsibility, and interagency cooperation.

Chair, John Savino addressed the Group:

Before I go on to the call to the Public, I'd like to, so we can get on with this thing, I'd like to have our new Director, Mr. Bryan Martyn, say a few words to us. Mr. Martyn you have the floor.

Executive Director Bryan Martyn addressed the Group:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. First, I want to thank the community for your commitment and dedication to providing access to OHV for the state. I appreciate your help in getting OHV dollars to OHV projects. I'll say that again, getting OHV dollars to OHV projects. There are going to be a number of changes in the way we manage OHV, get OHV dollars to OHV projects. I had a meeting this morning with three of your members, Don, Pete and John, kind of philosophically on why we're doing what we're doing and the direction ahead. I can't emphasize enough the fact that we are partners. We are

partners in that recently, I think, in the last few months that hasn't been the feeling. One of my jobs is to try to mend that fence, to mend those feelings, knowing that that is a two way street, and I am confident we will both work towards demonstrating that we are committed to the mission of getting OHV dollars to OHV stuff. When I came into the job, there was some consternation about the efficiency at which we were getting OHV dollars to OHV things, and I was quick to realize that it was quite possible that there were some personalities involved, that were keeping your money from getting to the right projects. I think there's more than personalities involved, I think there's some procedures involved as well, and we're going to work to mitigate those things. We are going to ensure that the right projects get funded, and that's where your role comes in. Make no mistake; Arizona State Parks are not experts at OHV. I am a helicopter pilot by trade; I tell people all the time, if you want to know how to get into downtown Bagdad at night, you call me! If you want to run a state park you talk to the experts who run state parks, the Jay Reems, the Kent Ennis' of the world. When I want to know about OHV stuff, I'm going to call OHVAG, and that's not just John Sevino, make that clear, although he does represent your body, I'm going to call the OHVAG. I expect you to act as a body, you are Arizona State Parks Professional arm of this thing that we are tasked by the Legislation to manage. I did not write that Legislation guys, it's the way it is. Our job is to manage these funds, and we're going to do the best we can. We talk about the twelve percent of that that is used to manage it. It is what it is, I'm going to use the twelve percent, if I don't need all twelve percent, I won't use all twelve percent. There's also some money out there that's above and beyond, it's about \$692,000. That \$692,000 that we're using of your money was brought upon by the Arizona State Legislature, and they had to prioritize, where are we going to spend the money, education, medical, or parks. Guess what, parks fell off the table. We had to demonstrate to The Legislature, that if you want to keep your State Parks open you need to give us some more funding options, they provided OHV as one of those options, and we had to utilize it. Philosophically, I have a big problem with that; I don't like using your money to clean bathrooms; which is the basic you know, to run parks. I'm already committed to weaning Arizona State Parks off of your money. I don't know that timeline. We are moving towards revenue generation as a park system. As we make more money, as we become more efficient, we will need less and less and less of your money. I want to make that clear; I said that correctly, we will need less and less of your money.

So, first, I thank you for allowing us to utilize your money without going crazy, I think I would have been very vocal. Not that you haven't been vocal; but we're not, I'm not hooked on your money, I want to get off it, so, that's important. Getting OHV money to OHV stuff. I'm going with the law on this. I asked staff, I said "Ok what does the law say". According to the AORCC statute (and not the OHVAG statute, apparently) AORCC is part of this decision process, AORCC is tasked with managing some funds in the state and if we could find that chapter and verse, that would be great, that says OHV falls under AORCC. I wanted to go with the law and put procedures in place that brought the decision making of grants back to the body that was tasked legislatively to make those decisions, in this case, Arizona State Parks Board. I think they were shirking their responsibility, that's what they are assigned to do, nominated to do. We're going to put in place (I need OHV experts) and I'm required to have the expertise of AORCC at the table, and I need staff recommendations based on grant proposals. To that end, this body, and all three bodies, are going to utilize the grading criteria. This is not about "I don't like that guy", "I think that project's jacked-up", "It doesn't mean what we do"... there's a way to do that...it's called the grading criteria. You have worked on

this criteria already, and Arizona State Trails, this is on statute as well, has determined a lot of these categories. My expectation, is that this body, as individuals you will fill out the form, I don't care if you put a zero or an eight, I don't care, You as a body, will figure out what number you want to put in there. If you have a question, a technical question, a legal question, that's what we're here for. We, as staff, and I'll use "we as staff", we will have filled this out already from our perspective, and we're not going to share it with you. If you have a question about what we think it is, that's where you ask, or if you're like "are we missing the boat here" or "is there more to this" or "what do you think"? Those are all valid questions that staff will answer with their "technical opinion". Their personal opinion - I don't care what their personal opinion is...I don't care. I care what your personal opinion is, I don't care what their, they haven't been given the right to a personal opinion on this; their very black and white, this is how it is, so I expect you as individuals, however you come up with this as a body, to fill out this list, these numbers, you grade it however you want. Then as a body, I expect you to come up with your master list of, this is what we, as OHVAG, think these projects should be graded and recommended or not recommended. If you don't recommend something, I need to know why because I can't read your minds. I have to be the filter that takes this to the Board, so when the Board is going to make a decision, they're going to know why you thought it was a bad idea. One of the things on this form that you need to talk about is a baseline. A baseline is basically a cutoff, above this number we approve, below this number we disapprove. That takes some of the ambiguity out of it. You have the right as a body to ignore that number. You may grade something very high, you may grade it very high, and you as a body decide we're not recommending it. That's fine; I got to know why you deviated from this standard that you've set. And if there's something that grades low, for example like an Ambassador's Program, the Ambassador's Program generally doesn't grade high on these criteria, but if you think that's something that should receive monies, recommend it and write why you recommend something that falls below the line. You're just giving the Board, the decision makers, the ability to make an educated decision on this project. I got to know if it's a good idea or bad idea. I got to know. And I say I, now I'm the one who's interceding, I'm the one talking to the Board. They need to know if it's a good idea or bad idea.

Three packets will go before the Arizona State Parks Board; one from you, one from AORCC, one from staff. You all look at the problem a little bit differently, that's fine, I will tell you, that it should eventually, be where, my hope is, that State Parks Board looks at your packet first. That's my hope. That's your job at this point, to establish a relationship, to establish a reputation, where you're the experts. That's... you'd be a fool to not go to the experts to manage money, that's your job. Start to establish or re-establish your reputation as the guys that get along and come up with solid reasons why or why we shouldn't fund things. I think we've lost that in the last few months, we're working towards that. Those three packets will go up to the Board, the Board; the State Parks Board will look at them, will evaluate them, and make a decision. Guess what, sometimes they are going to disagree with you, sometimes they are going to disagree with staff, sometimes they are going to disagree with AORCC. That is the way it is. You have the ability to lobby the State Parks Board through me. If you think that your position is so valid, and you're worried that it will not get through because staff might recommend another way...you're tasked to call me, you're tasked to lobby me.

Question from Don French:

When are we going to be able to see the other's score so that we need to know the, if we have a...

Director Bryan Martyn:

I think we can talk about that, I think that after, after you make your decisions as a body, then, I think you can get... o.k....this is what the staff said, and then eventually the AORCC will come up with a procedure...Ok you can get...this is what AORCC said...and that gives us time.

Chairman John Savino:

You promised us that you would look, and you still are just taking on AORCC, your just taking advice, you are going to take a look at it yourself to see the statute, how it's spelled out.

Director Bryan Martyn:

Yes, I need chapter and verse. If they are not required chapter and verse, they will not be in the pool. There is no reason to increase the bureaucratic mess that grant writing is, if they're not in statute. If they are in statute, my hands are tied. Deal with it! This is... Ok that's great, pass this over to Mr. Katz...oh and one other thing...just... I'm not your enemy guys, we are not your enemy, we're working together, we're hiring an OHV coordinator, you have a member that's going to be on the hiring committee, you are part of the hiring process. I need to find an OHV guy or gal who speaks your language who's respected in your community, to help move these pieces around. We are also hiring a planner; the planner is going to help move things around. They do some recreational trails stuff, as well, so not all the money (and this was a question) not all the money to fund that position will be from OHV. I will tell you the coordinator position, that's your dollars working for you. So, that's who's paying for that position. The planner position, we'll split that up, that's not all yours. They'll do a little bit of everything.

Finally, you got your packets two days before this... unacceptable, that is unacceptable, we cannot expect you, as a body, to manage millions of dollars, literally millions of dollars, in some cases today hundreds of thousands, but millions of dollars, with two days notice for guys with full time jobs. That's not cool. That's not what our taxpayers deserve. From now on, from this day forward, you will have two weeks; you will get your packets two weeks out, all right. Two weeks, now the ownness in on you, you've got two weeks, you better find the time or you better not be on this Board, this body. Two weeks to make your recommendations, to come up with your score sheet, your individual score sheet, come up with your list of questions, and oh, by the way, you can ask questions early, you can always call early. Say "hey, what do you think, what are you missing", you don't have to discuss it all here, you can't discuss it among yourselves, but you can always call staff. All right, so you'll get two weeks. That starts today, if you don't feel comfortable making decisions on the packets you have today, I've given you a thirty day window, a thirty day window to have another meeting. All right, but that's it. This is the way we're going forward.

The taxpayers need to know your making decisions, the Board, the State Parks Board need to know your making educated decisions and not on your way up on your drive. That's not cool. We're not going to do that. So, that's where we're at. I encourage you to reach out to the community and tell them that the direction we are taking is as a

partnership, as friendship, and as stewards of taxpayer dollars. All right, because I could be your friend all day, if it doesn't make sense to the taxpayer, I'm defaulting to the taxpayer, just so you know. That's where we're at, I'm anxious to fix this.

For the community out there who wants my head on a platter, which I have received e-mails –subject line “your head on a platter”, I ask you to tell them to relax, take a deep breath, give us six months to demonstrate our commitment to the OHV world.

You will see OHV more and more prominently on Arizona State Parks including our marketing and literature. You will see OHV typed stuff on our brochures. Arizona State Parks is your friend, you will have more places to ride as we move forward, we'll talk about that, but you are our partner, I appreciate your commitment to this group, I appreciate the money you've given to allow State Parks to operate, and I am very excited about the future of State Parks and OHV. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Statement from Chairman John Savino:

Thank you. Real quick, before we move on, because we have time constraints. I'll cover it later in the meeting, it's on the agenda, but I have to say, I came out of that meeting with Bryan with a positive attitude. We addressed a lot of stuff, the Ambassador Program, what have you, which I'll go into, but I came out of it with a positive attitude that things are going to change.

Director Bryan Martyn addressed the Group:

Please get out to your communities and let them know, let them know that, just...deep breath, just everybody take a deep breath, we're going to be all right. You're passionate people in your community. God Bless them! Take a deep breath before they start lopping off heads. Because mine isn't the only head they're trying to lop off. We're going to fix this. I have other meetings, I apologize. Thank you for your time. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman John Savino:

Thank you for coming and meeting with us and meeting with us earlier today it went a long way to fixing our problems.

Director Bryan Martyn addressed the Group:

My door is open. My door is open! If I have time, it's yours. All right, if I have time, it's yours.

Chairman John Savino:

Great! Thank you very much.

John Savino addressed the Group:

At this time, I'm going straight to agenda item number, I have to find the agenda item, can somebody help me here,

Don French:

Staff Report, 2A

John Savino addressed the Group:

2A, Ok We're going to move up to 2A in Staff Reports, it's of course, staff will report on the feasibility of OHV recreation in State Parks. I'd like to turn it over, and before I do

this I have to get our house in order, I forgot again to have on tape, introduce our staff and Attorney General's Office.

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Kent Ennis, Deputy Director, Arizona State Parks

Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources & Public Program, Arizona State Parks

Robert Baldwin, Grants Coordinator

Paul Katz, Attorney General Office representing State Parks

Annie McVay, Arizona State Parks

C. REPORTS

2. Staff Reports:

a. (TIME CERTAIN 11:05 AM) Staff will report on the feasibility of OHV recreation in State Parks.

Attachment D2a – Evaluation Model

Attachment D2b1 – Chart

Attachment D2b2 – Chart page 2

Annie McVay addressed the Group:

Ok Thank you, this might be brief because then I thought I was going to be 20 minutes ago, but I'm more than welcome to come if you guys have questions on anything specific I can come back to you next meeting, unlike everything else your doing today, this isn't really time sensitive, so we can discuss it whenever. I also want to thank OHVAG for the opportunity to work on this report, it was really great to come back to State Parks and also to look at our State Parks through a new set of eyes. It also got me back on a quad for the first time in a few years, so that was really fun. I have a copy of the full report, I didn't print copies for everyone because it's a lot of paper and I'm not sure if you're going to read it, but your more that welcome if you want to request a copy to look at these now. But I think the information is well summarized in these three sheets. When I came to you, I can't remember if it was the March or April meeting you went over the criteria that we were going to look to which you were going to look at a State Park to which were feasible for OHV use and those criteria are pretty much in this evaluation model. So what we did, we took the criteria which was pretty much it is OHV use consistent with the mission of the Park, is there sufficient acreage in the Park, does the Park border other Federal Lands or Public Lands that has existing OHV routes to understand what is feasible. For the most part, our Parks are not very feasible for OHV use primarily due to acreage. You can look down this is a list of all of our Parks; the second column shows you how many acres are at our Park. There's no general rule of thumb of how many acres would make a good OHV Park. We went roughly with 500 acres to be a park that could be a stand-a-lone OHV area. You probably wouldn't trail your vehicles for the same level of experience for less than 500, so that was sort of the rule of thumb, although there's lots of reasons why that may or may not be true but that's a case by case. So, very few of our parks were over that acreage some of them were, but they have, like Picacho Peak is more than that but most of the acres of that is mountain so it just couldn't work. The next thing like is that would it be sufficient acreage for a staging area, and this of course a staging area could be very tiny it's accessing great land. So a

lot of our Parks did have enough acreage for staging areas, the next question was, well, does it border Public Lands or Areas with OHV routes. So, between the first three or four, most of our Parks were kicked out. A lot of our Parks are historic in nature, less than five acres, some of them are stage alone areas with no existing Federal Land or Public Lands with no OHV routes nearby. So that was the process. The four that we ran through in this flow chart that still had feasibility, were Alamo Lake, Buckskin Mountain, Lyman Lake and Picacho Peak. So, for Alamo Lake and Buckskin Mountain, both of those areas now are currently being used as staging areas by the public, they don't have a lot of land on them for actual destination OHV routes, but there is a great possibility for staging areas, they both border Beeline Land. If you're not familiar, Buckskin Mountain is along the Colorado River just South of Parker.

John Savino:

When you talk about Buckskin Mountain, are you talking about the annex of it, the little River Island?

Annie McVay:

No, everything is on the east side of 95.

John Savino:

Right, well River Island is down just past the market, it's a little, it's an extension, it's managed by Buckskin.

Annie McVay:

No, we're talking about Buckskin.

John Savino:

Ok so, you're talking about Buckskin...so, Ok

Annie McVay:

An actually, I hadn't, usually when I've gone to Buckskin, I've gone over to the Westside, I think it's along the river it's where all the campers are, and if you'll notice, it's where all the acreage cause we don't utilize it on the east side of the highway. And if you go there on a weekend, right now in the winter time, our acreage is just filled with people pooling over and just staging informally...and accessing their routes along the property. So, it would great to formalize that. High feasibility. Now, it's up to the Parks. This study only shows what's feasible but there's no decision making, this is all objective criteria, and the Parks can decide where they will want to take that.

David Moore:

Is there access from the River across the highway over to the other side?

Annie McVay:

There is no access over the highway... no safe access.

John Savino:

There's a bridge there going from one side to the other, it's a walking bridge...a hiking trail across, a walking bridge across the road. That may be utilized for using ATVs.

Pete Pfeifer:

I had a question for the San Raphael?

Annie McVay:

Yes?

Pete Pfeifer:

Ok it says that OHVs are not consistent with Park mission. What is the mission of that Park?

Annie McVay:

The current mission, the area was bought with natural areas money, so the current mission is to protect the short grass Prairie on the property.

Pete Pfeifer:

Now, could it be simply a destination where people could just go up and visit the ranch and what not? Because, the gate is always closed.

Annie McVay:

It could be; we kind of left the San Raphael off for consideration just for right now, with the border issues, we don't know what to do with it in any aspect right now

Pete Pfeifer:

Ok, because I've ridden down there for twenty five years, I'm always going by that place, you know it's a, you know were not riding up to the ranch because, like I said, the gate is always closed. But those, those roads down there, people with street legal OHVs and stuff like that often go down there cause it's just real pretty. You know, for photo safaris or for whatever you want to do.

Annie McVay:

Well, I can look into the maps there, we were thinking mainly, because of that acreage, I don't know which one of them is listed, ...of the seven thousand, only 300 is Parks proper and the rest is conservation easement with ranchers.

Pete Pfeifer:

Yeah, well we're not like; we don't want to go riding around on the ranch...

John Savino:

One of the deals-issues that we're dealing with here, is that State Parks, the majority of them aren't on State Parks Land they're on leased land from BLM and whatever the Forest Service, like Fool Hollow is Forest Service. So then they have to go along with what those rules are too within the, you know, that land.

Annie McVay:

I can look more into it too if you want.

Pete Pfeifer:

I'm working on a project now, it's called Arizona Backcountry Discovery Route, it goes all the way across the state and it goes right by that place. On our way down to Lochiel and all that

Annie McVay:

Ok, I'll look at it, and if nothing else, I'll just make sure that information is in the report.

Pete Pfeifer:

Yeah, just curious.

John Savino:

Ok, go ahead Annie.

Annie McVay:

The other high feasibility is Alamo Lake, I don't know if, who's all been out to Alamo Lake,

John Savino:

Yeah, we've gone there quite a bit during...

Annie McVay:

it's sort of a "no brainer" good for OHV use, it borders BLM land, where there is quite a bit of OHV use in the area, there's a lot of back country camping. State Parks is the only place that has facilities like showers, I don't know if who's there that currently sell gas or...

John Savino:

Yes, there is, on the other side of the Lake...there's gas

Don French:

You have to cross the River

John Savino:

Yeah, you have to cross the River when it's full

Annie McVay:

So there is one camping area right now, where they've formally set aside for OHV use where you can take your vehicles straight from your campsite about a quarter of a mile till you're on BLM Land, it is sort of informally done right now. State Parks would have to formalize that, make it more known.

The other two are currently low feasibility, but with planning could maybe have future potential and that is Lyman Lake. I know you guys have seen a lot about Lyman Lake. I went up there and went through with the riding group up there. They have a great vision for the area; although the vision would take a lot of planning from the Park they see hitting Springerville and everything like that. The land right now that they are looking to put routes on is not public land so it's sort of, there are a lot of challenges about twenty five miles between the park proper and public lands.

John Savino:

One of the questions I have with on Lyman Lake... is that... one of my issues were, is that, and I live up in that area, is that, what would, why, first of all its going to cost a lot of money to put into these parks to develop them for OHV use; what benefit, when people come up to the White Mountains, during the winter time, forget it! It's snowed in, during the summer time, is a person when they come up there are they going to Lyman Lake or are they going to Big Lake where there's all the pine trees. Well, my answer is, I would much rather be 3000 foot higher and be at Big Lake than be at Lyman Lake. You can go over here to Roosevelt Lake and get the same thing. So, you have to take that into consideration when we're figuring it out where do we get our best bang for the buck.

Annie McVay:

So, we can put it down as future potential, although it's not immediate high potential area, to be great, it would take years of planning and someone would have to buy easements and someone would have to manage those easements, construct the trails, so it's a long future planning effort. But if the community has a vision, that's how the best projects get started. It wouldn't fall under; I think the responsibility of State Parks.

The other one is Picacho Peak where it's currently there's lots of issues in making that happen, there is future potential, everything on the east side of I-10 is BLM there's lots of routes there, Pinal County in their long term management plan, has a proposed OHV Park. In the matter of getting over I-10 safely, so that could be an issue, but definitely Picacho could be a staging area for that property. There is also a small piece of property that State Parks owns on the east side of I-10 that we don't utilize, that would be great access to that area, but that we're waiting if the switchyard goes in or not, so that's depending...there's just a lot future things that would have to happen but that could be an amazing riding area. Considering all that, for the most part there just was not the acreage or the surrounding public lands for the rest of our parks.

John Savino:

When you talk about may be, and here are my own thoughts on this thing, when going into this project... I was more concerned about being able to tell somebody that they could go and use the facilities, the park and then be able to ride from there, obey the speed limits and what have you through the park to get out to a BLM trail, there's a whole different issue, then what we do is from that park - Alamo for instance, we have that availability, then we work with BLM to fund the BLM trails. So, the big thing was, is it possible does BLM have it. Your statement about Lyman Lake for instance, that's private land around there, there's a lot of private land-that's going to be a big problem, when you talk about Alamo now, that's all BLM and we ride in there every winter, we have rides in there so, I know that's feasible, so, just keep that in mind when we do this.

Annie McVay:

Yeah, I think a lot of our parks are close to public lands, we looked at Roper for instance, although a lot of people use Roper as a camp ground, they have to keep their vehicles on street legal and on the roads or trailer them in but it's just not close enough where you could camp from there and leave from there and leave everything behind. It's enough miles through you know, the town of Safford to get to the Forest service, the same to get to Patagonia Lake, that's a great opportunity to camp, it has gas, but there's just enough miles on roads through towns to get to the Forest Service even though it's only like seven miles away, it's not a direct connection. But for all of those, we did list in

the statements that we would definitely promote that area as a campground, knowing that you would need to be street legal to get in or that you'd have to trailer your vehicles.

Robert Baldwin:

Perfect, 'cause that's what we're looking for. Is just to promote it and say "you guys can camp there and as long as your street legal, you can take off from there".

Annie McVay:

This was sort of just a destination OHV place without having to trailer your vehicle.

John Savino:

Ok are you done?

Annie McVay:

I'm done

John Savino:

Ok any questions from our group? Is there any questions? Don?

Don French:

I was just wondering, who was on the assessment team for this? I mean who did you, you or ...

Annie McVay:

It was myself and the Park Managers.

Don French:

Oh, Ok Thank you.

John Savino:

Any other questions?

Kent Ennis:

Well, yeah...Annie, what would you say with AORCC, it's an open ended question, would you see as the, these are great recommendations, and I know she did a really thorough report but what are the next steps?

Annie McVay:

Well, the next steps were to hand these off to the high feasibility parks, to the parks staff and park managers and see what we did, in that report there's a rough cost estimate of what it would take to get Buckskin Mountain as a destination of around \$300,000. Then it's next to State Parks to make a decision on "is that something we want to move forward with" at that point it would be a... OHV issue... high feasibility...do we want to use it...

John Savino:

Annie, the only thing that I could recommend is this, and I too feel that it was a good survey that you did, a lot of work you put into it, Buckskin for instance, Ok, we have to take into consideration, it's not only, it's one thing having the land right there, now, where

do you go? That area, Don and I, it's near and dear to us, we grew up there, there's only one rock trail going out of there...

Annie McVay:

Actually, look at the report, I met with the BLM, we put together a map and it's in the larger report

John Savino:

Oh, Ok

Annie McVay:

Of everything they currently have, and they're planning, I think their plan is going to be adopted soon, so the plan I have, the trails they have in there are from like what they were willing to put on a public map.

John Savino:

Ok so, you did look into that then.

Annie McVay:

Yes, there's a map of our area and all of the routes that connects to it that are currently open.

John Savino:

Great, great. Ok, I appreciate it. Any other questions? From staff? Bob, anything? No? Doris, Do you have anything to add to this?

Doris Pulsifer:

No, Im good.

John Savino:

Pete?

Pete Pfeifer:

I just want to request a copy of that report.

Annie McVay:

Sure, I don't think it will e-mail I think it's kind of big so. It's still draft, so it's not going to go on our website until the Parks Board Season but I'm more that welcome to go and

Pete Pfeifer:

E-mail or excuse me, mail it to me

Annie McVey:

Burn a disc and give it to you...

Don French:

Are these for us?

Annie McVay:

Those are for you guys, I didn't want to print out more than... that would get wasted paper, but I can get them...

John Savino:

Your next step, your, are you presenting this to the Board, this is a draft, are you presenting it to the Board?

Annie McVay:

Yes, it goes to AORCC on the [September] 15th and then it'll go to the Board on [September] the 20th. I'm not sure who'll be presenting it but whether it will be myself or...

Annie McVay:

Ok Yeah, you're not getting out of that.

Kent Ennis:

Yeah, you're not getting out of that.

Annie McVay:

I can try.

Robert Baldwin:

I will send copies. You've got copies now? I've got one now. Ok you guys (Pete & David) keep those and I'll send you guys...

David Moore:

Appreciate it.

Annie McVay:

I can print some up before I go real quick. It'll be easier.

John Savino:

Well, thank you, do you have anything else?

The Group thanks Annie McVay.

John Savino:

Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming and doing this good report.

C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC – No Public present.

D. REPORTS – may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects:

1. OHV Program Partner Reports – Representative from the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, AZ Game & Fish Department or other agencies and organizations are allotted time to make presentations at the request of the Group or on behalf of their agency or organization.

No reports scheduled.

2. Staff Reports:

b. Staff will present information on the travel reimbursement procedures.

Kent Ennis:

Mr. Chairman we have a skilled member of our fiscal staff here, and if I may, she has some information with regard to the reimbursement of your travel expenses and so I...

Don French:

Very important

John Savino:

Ok we'll go to that right now then. Which one is that on here?

John Savino:

2B - Ok staff will present information on Travel Reimbursement Procedures update on 2012 revenue in the OHV...

John Savino:

All right. Keep me on track. Staff will present information on Travel Reimbursement Procedures. Please introduce yourself.

Miryom Snyder, Administrative Services addressed the group:

Good Morning Mr. Chairman and members, I'm Miryom Snyder with Arizona State Parks, I'm one of your Fiscal Services Managers, and although I do not supervise travel reimbursements, I do have some familiarity with them. I have some packages of information here for you; and you can go through them

I also have a disc with these files electronically and I believe also...

John Savino:

Miryom, put one there because we're going to have somebody come, one of our other members. Thank you.

Miryom Snyder:

You can follow along if you care to; the first page kind of gives you a re-cap of what's inside the package. Arizona State Parks does enjoy the privilege of being able to reimburse volunteers for out-of-pocket travel expenditures. The process for statutory boards and commissions is a little bit different from non-statutory advisory groups and committees. The process that our OHVAG members will use is very similar to our Park volunteers. It will not go through the State's payroll system as do the statutory board and commission members. You will be paid as a sort of like a professional services. One thing to keep in mind, meal reimbursements that do not involve an overnight stay do carry a tax liability. It's considered income, and it's reportable on your annual tax returns. So, just keep that in mind that, reimbursements for meals without overnight stay, does carry a tax liability, we do not withhold taxes, but it will be reportable on your personal income taxes. One of the first things that has to take place is to get you set up on the State's accounting system as a vendor eligible for payment. So the first form is the State of Arizona, substitute W9 and if possible we would like for you to fill them out,

complete them and give them to staff today so that we can get you prepared. So that when you do submit travel reimbursement claims, the accounting system already recognizes you.

John Savino:

Ok if you've filled them out you can just hand them to me and I'll hand them over to Doris.

Pete Pfeifer:

Yeah, do we know if they're filled out correctly, I guess would be a good question

Don French:

Can we have somebody check that before?

Miryom Snyder:

Yes, we can certainly do that. The little black-grey dots off to the left, as long as you complete the entry for each one of those segments and towards the bottom where it says- signature, title, date, if you will fill that information out. If there's anything missing we will contact you and items can be filled out and scanned and e-mailed to us.

The second form is the travel reimbursement form that is used by volunteers, the second to social security numbers can be a little problematic,

Pete Pfeifer:

Question on the form we're using? Are we using the older one? Is there an electronic one?

Miryom Snyder:

The electronic version is for state employees and for board and commission members.

Pete Pfeifer:

So, we're going to use this guy here?

Miryom Snyder:

Yes the, yes the less complicated... older electronic version. If you do not wish to put your social security number on your reimbursement claims, please just write "on file" and we will find it, but it is required on the substitute W9 form. The purpose of your travel needs to be very clear, the address portion, if your physical home address is not where you wish to have your checks returned, on the W9 form there's an opportunity to put a remits address if you have a post office box or something else where you'd like your checks mailed to. The address on your reimbursement form should be your home address, however. It is important that for each leg of your journey, that you include the date and time and please indicate whether it's morning or evening, a.m. or p.m.

Don French:

Question real quick? Like for me today gone... in one day, go, is it start & finish, home to home or it would be 2 entries?

Miryom Snyder:

It would be 2 separate entries, and if your journey of one day, includes starting here and going to this point for a purpose, coming over here and then the following day going home, please be sure to clearly indicate the legs of your journey. If you're using personal vehicles, and we will be reimbursing you for personal mileage, MapQuest provides excellent documentation for the number of eligible miles. A printout of the MapQuest page with the number of miles, with the starting and ending locations, is a most acceptable and welcome documentation of your mileage.

Don French:

In lieu of the odometer start and finish?

Miryom Snyder:

In lieu of the odometer, you know, because you may, you may start from home, come directly to Phoenix, spend three days hanging out in town, although why in August I don't know, and then begin your eligible travel reimbursement at a much later odometer reading. Rather than having to track that, the printouts of the MapQuest from one location to another is a much better record for your mileage. The eligible reimbursements include transportation, overnight lodging, and meals. There are obviously rules governing them all, some of them can be a little convoluted and archaic. If we look at the page behind the travel form, you'll see across the top, that mileage reimbursements are 44.5 cents per mile. I know it says effective in 2006 but it's still valid. Towards the bottom, in code obviously, off to the right it says LDG and M & I, those are the maximum lodging reimbursement rates, that does not include tax that's your base lodging rate. The M & I is meals and incidental that is the maximum per meal and they're listed as breakfast, I'm sorry not per meal per day. If your travel includes a full day, you do not need to distinguish between breakfast, lunch and dinner. If you're eligible for all three meals, you're not held to the dollars in the separate breakfast, lunch and dinner categories. Along the bottom of that form, you can see that breakfast, lunch and dinner are separated into specific dollar amounts and depending on your location of travel, you will fall into one of those six max groups. Some locations within the state have a lower reimbursement rate for meals, others have higher. They are based on average prices for those parts of the state. So, the information on this page applies to the location in which you take your meals or the location in which you have your overnight lodging. If by chance, the location you're looking for is not represented specifically on this page, then all other locations are considered to be at the default rate which is the lowest of the six rate groups. All right, the following page, that starts out saying number 3, meal cutoff hours are follows: Here's where we get into some rather archaic rules. Your travel, in order to be eligible for meal reimbursements, your travel must extend for a certain number of hours and certain meals are eligible within certain time frames. Read carefully, follow closely, if we get your claim and something is somewhat out of order, we'll communicate with you likely via e-mail or telephone and we, we're not going to mail your claim back to you and ask you to submit a revised one but we'll communicate via telephone or e-mail. We treat our employees a little differently but...

Kent Ennis:

Or sometimes not.

Miryom Snyder:

Well, some people are faster learners than others. All right, the following page is, usually this is used for our internal purposes, it's mileage between our Parks and the Phoenix Office. You may find it useful if you're traveling from one of our Parks to another. Then, the last set is a presentation from the Department of Administration's general accounting office, and it's intended to answer a lot of frequently asked questions. Especially regarding what is reimbursable and what is not. So it... some of the concepts that it brings out that are important, is reimbursements are for actual out of pocket costs. So if the maximum for breakfast is seven dollars, that's not saying every breakfast is seven. We do ask you to supply original receipts. This is very important, original receipts are required. They should be attached to your claim. If by chance, you do not wish to give up your original receipt, because there might be something else on it that you need to retain for your records, let us know and we'll come up with a good compromise that suits your purposes. One of the frequently asked questions, if I'm traveling together with another member, and I booked the hotels on my credit card and I ended up paying for the lodging for another member, can I be reimbursed? And the answer is; most certainly. But, what's required is that your companion who did not pay for lodging, also submit a travel claim. Even if they are not requesting any reimbursement, that travel claim is support to reimbursing you for their lodging. Ok includes meals and any other reimbursements.

Do you have any other specific questions at the moment? Would you want to go through the information presentation at all?

Pete Pfeifer:

Basically, just making sure that we fill the paperwork out correctly.

Miryom Snyder:

It's true, you know if there's a blank line and you don't have anything to put in it, put "not applicable" if not applicable, put a line through it. Just something to let us know that there should not be any information in that area. Ok?

John Savino:

Is there a certain time frame that you need these back, for a meeting as like today?

Miryom Snyder:

General accounting says travel claims submitted within three months of the end of travel is considered timely. They've gotten very... picky about late submissions of travel claims and it requires the Director's approval or the State Comptroller's approval it's, it's a little over the top. So, the turnaround time once we receive your claim and everything is in order, is very short. We have the ability to pay each business day the checks are issued that night; they go into the mail the next business day. Just because staffing is short, I think they do them in groups once a week, all volunteer travel once a week. If you do have a pressing kind of issue you can let us know as I said, we do have the ability to pay each business day.

Doris Pulsifer:

The Budget per Advisory Group for travel?

Miryom Snyder:

The budget for each Board Commissioned Advisory Group for this year is \$3000 for fiscal year which began this last July 1. So, any travel which you have incurred this last month or so is still eligible for reimbursement. If for some reason you did incur costs but did not retain your receipts let us know, I don't believe there is a form attached here for a lost or replacement receipt form but that form does exist and if you find yourself in that situation, we will supply you with that.

John Savino:

Do we send it to you in care of you at this at State Parks?

Miryom Snyder:

If you address your envelope to Fiscal Services, actually on the first informational sheet, these, the lady who prepared this first list of six points, she is the person who will actually process your travel claims, her name is Toni Leon, if you wish to send your claims to her attention, her name is well known in mail distribution centers in this building, and you are more than welcome to call or e-mail myself with any questions or any further clarification. Toni's e-mail address is A Leon, her first name is Antonia, so it's just like mine, but instead of M. Snyder it's A L E O N. She works five days a week and she's very responsive to her e-mails.

John Savino:

All right is there any questions? Bob?

Robert Baldwin:

Other than these meetings, what type of travel are they eligible for?

Kent Ennis:

Official Business.

Robert Baldwin:

Ok so, if they think they have official business they need to get approval from us or identify it as us or what is it going to take to identify it as official business.

Kent Ennis:

Well, I think our intent was group meetings. I don't know how that... I don't know.

Robert Baldwin:

If they travel to a Board Meeting is that official business?

Kent Ennis:

If it's a Board Meeting, that's official business.

Miryom Snyder:

Excuse me Mr. Chairman, I believe the wording in the Board motion is "approved meetings" it did not specifically mention that committee's approved meetings, I believe it referred to approved Board State Parks.

John Savino:

Ok all right, sounds good. Is everybody clear on this? Any questions? Ok Thank you very much for your presentation it cleared up a lot of stuff.

Miryom Snyder:

Thank you very much.

John Savino:

Don do you have one? Do you have a question? Kent?

Kent Ennis:

I will say that, of course, if you get all your ducks in a row and send in your, get your documents sent in, and Toni is fast, so this is not like some government agencies, you might be surprised how fast you get your money back.

John Savino:

Great, thank you. Your (David Moore) the only one that I haven't gotten one this from.

David Moore:

I'll get it to you.

John Savino:

Here, do you want these, or do you want Doris to have these W9 forms?

Miryom Snyder:

If Doris or Bob will collect them and that way we can make sure that you're a member who will be attending later. Will also be included and get set up.

John Savino:

Ok I'm going to go onto

D. REPORTS – may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects:

1. OHV Program Partner Reports – Representative from the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, AZ Game & Fish Department or other agencies and organizations are allotted time to make presentations at the request of the Group or on behalf of their agency or organization.

No reports scheduled.

2. Staff Reports:

c. Update on 2012 revenue in the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and the amount available for projects. Staff will respond to a question OHVAG had regarding travel expenditures (See attachment D.2.c.4).

**Attachments D.2.c.1, D.2.c.2 & D.2.c.3 have been provided.
Attachment D.2.c.4 – RE Travel Expenditures Line Item**

Robert Baldwin:

Mr. Chair, Group. You've seen these sheets before, we've had them every meeting and they are produced monthly. This is the yearend report for 2012. Back in February, well first off if you'll look at page 6, Attachment D.2.c.2, I'm sorry, Attachment D.2.c.1, page 5, kind of in the middle of the page there under OHV Program Administration, down in the middle there, it says travel within the state, it says \$6500. Have you located that?

Ok so, on page 9, back in February you asked what that's all about? At that time it said \$6588.21 and Ms. Snyder wrote a response to your inquiry there about what that is, as you can see it's been corrected. That is the budget figure for Motor Pool expense for the truck that we use for OHV stuff basically, it's not for travel reimbursements of any kind. All right, other than that, on page 5, down at the very bottom in the right hand corner, if you have your magnifiers on, \$1.944328 million is the dollars sitting in the pot waiting to get out on the ground. That's not including any money that's going to come in during this calendar year.

John Savino:

Have any of these grants that have been approved at the last State Parks Board Meeting been, have you issued any money out or is it still sitting in this.

Robert Baldwin:

It's still sitting in this.

Don French:

That was about \$700,000 or something Bob?

Robert Baldwin:

Yeah, something like that. For the OHV portion and then we had about \$600k in RTP.

John Savino:

Right.

Don French:

So we got 1.2...

Robert Baldwin:

To give out through this year. Ok other than that, page 6 and 7 is kind of a re-cap of the status of projects out there now, how much money has been spent out of those and the open and close, those dollar figures are current through the end of the fiscal year, and this is the 13 month report so anything that was turned in at the end of June was included in there as it would be here. And that's the status of the expenditures on those, and we processed a few the other day but there really hasn't been any other requests for reimbursement on any of these.

John Savino:

Bob, can you explain something, I know you, and bear with us here, I know you've explained this before, but it went over our heads a little bit. Some of this money, such as the... we approved that grant a couple of years ago for the Kids in the Woods Program but then that Program kind of fell by the wayside, that money, did it ever go out of State

Parks any of it ever go out of State Parks to fund that Program? And one more thing, and if it didn't is it in this \$1.9m or is it still in holding since we approved this project?

Robert Baldwin:

Mr. Chair and Group that is a Line Item under Projects there. Project number... this is on page 6 left hand side, Project Number 571017-Kids in Woods Program.

John Savino:

Ok

Robert Baldwin:

They were advanced...I couldn't tell you the exact amount, they were advanced the money, the program didn't go anywhere and we've gotten that money back. I don't know why it still says open on there but the project is dead in the water. They spent \$89.99 and which was which they kept out of their refund, we have reminded them that they need to return that too. So, the whole pot of money has been returned and that amount would probably not be in that figure because that is unobligated money, the \$1.9m is unobligated funds so, these would still show as obligated for this project, since it says open on here

John Savino:

Ok at some time though, it will go back into that \$1.9m pile

Robert Baldwin:

Right.

John Savino:

How many other ones are out there like that? That are that we've approved the funding for and it's in limbo.

Robert Baldwin:

Well, there's one on BLM Hasayampa, I think its Project #... one of the BLM Hasayampa Projects hasn't, we don't have an agreement signed and in fact, they have said that, that they wanted to return, cancel the grant and have Jeff apply for it and get the money directly through him. So that money would again be obligated so it wouldn't show on the \$1.9m. Anything that's been awarded is not in that \$1.9m.

Whether it's been paid out or spend it or anything. It doesn't, it's not in the \$1.9m. If they come in under budget, then obviously that money would go back into the fund, in addition to the \$1.9m, if again the grant gets cancelled, whatever the awarded amount was would go back into the \$1.9m, so, but none of the money for these projects is coming out of the \$1.9m. That's clear.

Don French:

If the money is obligated, it's already been pulled out of the...

Robert Baldwin:

Right. So that money is sitting in the pot waiting to be spent. Again, if it doesn't get spent, it goes back into the available pot.

John Savino:

Ok my next question is this \$1.9m that we're talking about, that's just sticker money and gas tax money in that one pot. The figure for the RTP money, that's a separate figure and we only have so much time to spend that money, otherwise we lose it back to the Federal Government. Correct?

Robert Baldwin:

Well, that whole process is kind of convoluted right now because we're getting more money available to us than ADOT is letting us spend. So I'm not exactly sure how it's going to work. Right now, for this year, they've capped our obligation authority, the amount of money that we can obligate at \$1.455 million, and that's for the whole project. So, half of that is non-motorized and half of that is motorized. So basically, they've told us we can spend \$775,000 to projects, award that to projects this year. Ok we have more money than that available to us but how we're going to get to that, I'm not sure, what the process is going to be because we're still working on basically 2010, 11 and 12 appropriations that have been given to us that haven't been given out, and those are about \$600,000 a piece. So, we have, so we have about \$1.8m million in motorized money that's, now that money is a, now we have three years from when it's given to us to obligate it, in other words award it to a project, and then we, and then they have five years to spend it. So it doesn't go away. If it's obligated within the three years, it doesn't go away until after five years. So, it's not really a matter of having to get it spent, but yes, we need to be able to obligate... Our full amount every year.

Of whatever they're going to let us obligate. And for this year, this would include the projects that are still awarded because they didn't get obligated in the previous fiscal year. And then anything else we awarded this year.

Thomas McArthur:

Clarification of the question? Does the \$1.9m include the \$700k?

Robert Baldwin:

No sir, that's the OHV Fund. This is the RTP Fund. We don't hold the RTP money.

So, I mean that's not in our budget anywhere, except that we know what our appropriation is and basically how much we can award the projects.

John Savino:

The State Treasurer holds that money?

Robert Baldwin:

No, no Federal...

John Savino:

Federal Government holds that money?

Robert Baldwin:

Federal Highways holds it.

John Savino:

All right.

Kent Ennis:

If I could through an editorial comment in, small one, the ADOT has been swept to the, over the years to the tune that none of us could imagine, and so now they are almost entirely a Federal Shop. There's not much state money left there and so, in fact the person who, the Deputy Chief Financial person over there is someone I know pretty well from our previous lives, and we're not in any danger, immediately of losing that money but they, for the first time they are looking at it carefully in the sense of, if you're not using it, we know who can and so, it is a priority to try to get this Federal money used.

John Savino:

I do know that Bob has in the grant process; he has looked at you know- if it's possible to use that money, we're going to use that money. You know, there's only, there's only specific projects that qualify for it so it would behoove us to get out there. One of the problems that we face, give you an example, the Lakeside Ranger District up in the mountains. They qualify for the money, we've been approved on that stuff, but you can't get them to do anything. They, it's a Federal Agency and they're busy with the fire, you know getting the fire taken care of so we can't get them to put in for a grant to spend the money. So we're at a, I, I don't know what to do. I don't know. Do you have any suggestions on that Bob?

Robert Baldwin addressed the group:

Well, Mr. Chairman and Group, that's why in the last grant cycle, we opened up the application process to non-profits and even profit groups who want to work with a Federal Agency to actually manage the grant. The money is awarded to them and they write up the application and we enter into a contract with them so that they're responsible for managing the grant, the money and getting the project completed. Obviously, they need cooperation and approval from the Federal Agency, in order to do that. That's the scenario that Jeff has with BLM is, he has an agreement where he can apply for the money and they will let him do the work on their property. That's a very unique situation, he can't seem to establish that with the Tonto National Forest, but we're working on that, so I mean, just between Federal Entities, yeah, so that's why, you know, this Ace came in and made an application for money to, to do improvements on the Tonto National Forest because they could manage the money, they could get the project done. It doesn't take administrative, a lot of administrative time from the Federal Agency, so those types of things are what we're trying to promote and help the Agency use the money without burdening them with project responsibility.

John Savino:

Sort of like what we did with the Snowflake OHV Recreation Area? Where the Federal Government, the National Forest Service asked private 501 C3 to apply for the grant?

Robert Baldwin:

Yeah, that's the situation that the program opened up. Typically, we were not offering money to non-land managers.

John Savino:

Right.

Robert Baldwin:

In other words...because

John Savino:

But, I'm confused here.

Robert Baldwin:

Ok, who can build, who has the property to build an OHV facility. Not too many people.

John Savino:

But, I'm confused here. If, if the Federal Agency asked the 501 C to do the grant and they approved it... and yet we have the ton of money there we need to get rid of, yet the program was denied. That's kind of, how can we go forward with that? The program was that program was voted on by this group for approval, Snowflake OHV Recreation Area, and then it was denied by the State Parks Board. So I'm confused how do we, there's a prime example, why was it done?

Robert Baldwin:

Did you address that with the Director this morning?

John Savino:

Yes, and that's what he's going to take care of it.

Robert Baldwin:

Ok so, then that's, that's...

John Savino:

Yeah, but that, it's just that if we know, if we are going to do this, we have to, if we want to get the money out then, if we follow the rules it shouldn't be a thing. So, it was addressed by the Director. So, yes.

Don French:

Well, I'm confused about something too. Just because a 501C draws up the grant, it doesn't mean it's for a 501 C, right?

Don French:

So, we're not giving the grant to a 501 C then so do we still fall under all these guidelines?

Robert Baldwin:

The applicant still has to be an eligible applicant. If the 501 C3 is applying to do the work on Forest Service Property, they are the applicant, they enter into the contract with State Parks, they get the money, they manage the money, they send in the reimbursements and no, it's not an improvement for them, they don't own the property. So, all they are doing is providing their staff and time to manage the grant and managing the project for the land manager.

John Savino:

Just the handler, basically they're handling it.

Don French:

What...yeah, we're having trouble in getting people to put these grants in, the money's there and we're having a hard time finding qualified grants to put these in. I'm trying to think of a way to get grant writers out there that does this for the people to, like in this case, or that doesn't have the time to do it themselves. Does that seem to be, is that something that we could...

Robert Baldwin:

Well, first you have to get an Agency to agree to

Don French:

Well, I think they're out there they just don't have the time to....

Robert Baldwin:

Mr. Chairman and Group, even if you had a grant writer, the Agency still has to do all the work, they have to design the project, they have to identify the costs, they have to provide all that information to the grant writer in order for them to put it together in the grant package. So, you know, that still requires quite a bit of effort for the land manager part. So, yeah I mean, that's part of the reason we're not getting applications, they don't have people identified to do those things.

John Savino:

In my case, that's a prime example, they asked me to write the grant as The White Mountains Open Trails Association, I wrote it, they do all the work, they're the ones that would go out and hire the company to do the environmental impact study, they would go out with them, all I did was do their, facilitate their paperwork in a sense, then they would go out and do all the work to get that job done.

Thomas McArthur:

I think one of the things that we need to do is sort of inspire some of our organizations to start looking at designing projects, developing the memorandum understanding with the agencies and working with them but rather than looking to the agencies to come up with the projects, I think it's the community that needs to come up the project and develop the MOU to move forward with the variety of things.

John Savino:

It's a touchy situation because they have to develop the trust with that agency; it's still the agencies land. The agency has to do some work, so that means they're going to have to put some time in it and Bob, the agency that does put time in it, when they put time in it they can charge that back to the grant correct?

Robert Baldwin:

Mr. Chairman, Group, if in developing the project, they incorporate that kind of time into a project cost, then yes, it can be reimbursed to them or if it can be identified as any kind of match for the project, but in order for it to be associated with the project, it has to be identified in the application as a project cost. Whether it's volunteer time help, whether it's federal staff time help, or whether it's contract grant proposals, the components all have to be identified as part of the project cost. When the application is submitted.

John Savino:

Right. Ok do you have anything else Bob?

Robert Baldwin addressed the group:

Yes, well yeah, the last part of this report is page 8 there, Attachment D.2.c.3 that's your yearend summary of where your money's coming from for the fund, \$2.74 million total from the fund last year. And it's got your gas tax portion \$1.5m and your sticker decal \$1.2m and if you, we've given you these reports before, but if you look at that sticker money that's up considerably over last year. Probably like \$400k more than last year.

Don French:

You've been selling more stickers, huh?

Robert Baldwin:

Yes, the enforcements better, Game and Fish is sending out the reminders electronically, I mean there's a lot more awareness out there. They anticipate this should be up around 3 or 4 million dollars.

John Savino:

Right and it just a...and, and growing...

Robert Baldwin:

Based on the number of users...

John Savino:

And growing...it's one of our funds you know...it's just endless. Ok is that it Bob?

Robert Baldwin:

That's it for me.

John Savino:

Ok, thank you very much. Let's go on...are, ok are we done with reports then from staff?

D. REPORTS – may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects:

2. Staff Reports

d. Staff will report on any Parks Board actions affecting OHV funds, projects, or issues. –

At the June 12, 2012 Parks Board meeting the Board directed staff to develop a grant criteria and review system for review and approval by the Parks Board at their September meeting, and OHV grant applications must be reviewed by OHVAG, AORCC, and staff and all recommendations will be presented to the Parks Board for final action.

At the June 20, 2012 Parks Board meeting the Board approved the OHV Program budget recommendations and grant funding as proposed by staff.

**Attachment D.2.d.1 - Consider Recommendations for Off-Highway Vehicle
Recreation Fund Allocations for FY 2013**

Attachment D.2.d.2 - FY 2012 OHV Projects Staff Recommendations

Robert Baldwin:

Well, 2.d is the Parks Board actions, and those were included in your packet as Attachment D.2.d.1 and D.2.d.2. Those are what the Parks Board approved in their last meeting regarding the OHV budget and then the projects that were submitted.

John Savino:

Ok, does anybody have any questions on those, did you review them? The only thing I can say is that, when I do my Chairman's Report, which is three; we will talk about AORCC and I hope that Paul has some information for us on the legality of AORCC being in the picture here.

Paul Katz, Attorney General Office representing State Parks addressed the group:

I definitely, after lunch.

John Savino:

After lunch you'll have your...All right at that point

Robert Baldwin:

Alright we do have one other report here, and then the Ambassador Report we'll do later this afternoon. Item F.

In the packet is a the Staff Report on the strategy for the statewide OHV Program and page 18 is kind of a game plan for what we're going to do once we get our new coordinator on board. And the other pages there are position and descriptions that have been announced this past week that are part of improving the OHV Program overall.

John Savino:

Any questions on any of this? Again, I will cover some of this in our, in the discussion with Bryan, the Director and two of his staff.

Robert Baldwin:

Alright, and so, if you want to wait and do your report after lunch, and then the Ambassadors will be here after two o'clock so after we get into the other action...

John Savino:

I'd like to do that, that way Rebecca supposed to be here at 1:00, and she can be a part of this thing, and we can do the Report.

Robert Baldwin:

So, if you want to dismiss for lunch at this time, it would probably be ok.

John Savino:

Ok, I'd like to adjourn for lunch and we will be back at 1:00.

MEETING RECONVENED AT 1:10 PM

John Savino:

I'd like to first call the meeting back into order. I'd like to call the Arizona State Parks off Highway Vehicle Advisory Group Meeting on August 10th at 1:10 pm back into order. I'd like to pick up at this point with the Paul Katz Representative from the Attorney General's Office, you wrote so dang small I forget your last name.

Well that's a tough one, Katz, Paul Katz, Representative from the Attorney General's Office. The question that was posed to him, that during Bryan Martyn, Director Bryan Martyn's presentation was, the actual legality of having the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission involved with the Grant Rating process of, Grant Recommendation process of the off highway, The Arizona Motorized Off Highway Vehicle Grants, so Paul would you like to explain what you found out so far?

Paul Katz:

Sure, there are two things that I wanted to cover, Arizona Revised Statutes or as us lawyers say, A.R.S. Section 41-511.25 creates the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission and establishes its membership, powers and duties. I believe that that statute was originally promulgated in 1966, the current version I believe, was revised in 1984 and there were also provisions or portions that were amended in 1989 and in 2011 effective July 1st 2012. Irrespective of when this statute was promulgated, it has not been repealed. In paragraph A, I won't read the entire paragraph, states that the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission or AORCC is established. The Commission shall be composed of seven members consisting of the Director of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Director of the Arizona Parks Board and five members appointed by the Governor. And it goes on skipping a couple of sentences, that, two members appointed by the Governor shall be from the general public and each select shall have broad experience in outdoor recreation. Of the five appointed members, no more than two members shall reside in the same county. And it goes on. The paragraph B 3, I highlighted, and paragraph B says that the Commission shall, it doesn't say may or might, kind of, could of, or should of...it says shall. Paragraph 3 says establish criteria and policies, criteria and policies for the equitable distribution of funding, review applications for eligible projects, and determine the amount of funding, if any, for each project to be funded from the land and water conservation fund, the state lake improvement fund and the off highway vehicle recreation fund. And that's the statutory authority.

John Savino:

I wanted to; can I ask you a question?

Paul Katz:

Absolutely.

John Savino:

Ok you're the expert. So I'm, and I'm not an attorney, or don't claim to be. To me this says, I know, you know, at first glance what it says, but then reading it closely, after reading it more closely it doesn't say recommend grants to the State Parks Board, it says review. In my mind, in layman's terms, it means, review means looking at this and

saying “well yes”, I review this. It’s a whole nother issue if it says “recommend to the State Parks Board”, and that’s our issue, I don’t care who looks at it.

Paul Katz:

Ok here’s what it does, start at the beginning though- Establish criteria and policies. Criteria would be grant criteria, and policies for the administration of those grant criteria and the application process for the equitable distribution of funding. I won’t pretend to be a historical expert but what the Legislature has done by implementing this is to seek broad public input from off-road vehicle users, from fish and wildlife people, from hunters, fishermen, hikers, bikers, trekkers, photographers, you name it, I think their intent is to get broad input. Under the law, the State Parks Board makes the final decisions as to how Off Highway Vehicle Recreation funds are to be expended. They actually have the power, and I mean no offense to Bryan, but they make the final decisions as to who gets funded and how much. I attended the June 12, 2012 Park Board Meeting and I am not a reporter and I definitely don’t have a photographic memory, but in your minutes today, under 1...under paragraph 2 D as in David, it does say that at the June 12th 2012 Parks Board Meeting the Board directed staff to develop a grant criteria and review system for review and approval by the Parks Board at their September meeting. OHV grant applications must be reviewed by OHVAG, AORCC and staff and all recommendations will be presented to the Parks Board for final action. I think strong deference should be given to OHVAG but legally you are an Advisory Group that can be created, modified and, I hope not, but even dissolved on action of the Parks Board. And I think that they very much, and it’s my own personal observations, that they appreciate very much the input that you give to them, but I think that they both have, or the Parks Board had both policy and legal reasons for wanting to have input from staff, from you folks, as well as from the diversity of interests that are represented at AORCC.

John Savino:

So, in a sense, what’s happened here in the last month is that, our, our voice has gone from one half, because it was staff and our voice, Off Vehicle Advisory Group’s voice, to a one third voice.

Paul Katz:

Well, I can’t answer that because the Parks Board has the right to give as much or as little way to the recommendations of staff, you folks and AORCC as they think appropriate, and that will be decided ultimately, at a public meeting, at which any members of the public, including every single member of this Advisory Board can attend and give their input, letters can be written, so, I don’t think it’s a question of power as much as gaining as much information as the Parks Board can and they feel obligated to make sure that those funds get expended wisely for off-road users of all kinds.

David Moore:

But all kinds don’t pay the sticker fees.

Paul Katz:

When I used to go out hunting and fishing and was going off road, I had to have those stickers to take my vehicles...

David Moore:

Yeah, but the bulk of this money that we're talking about was created from OHV sticker fund which is strictly from ATVs and UTVs. I'm a hunter too, and I go to all those places, but I'm telling you that the money that we're talking about spending all those groups that you mentioned, don't contribute to it.

Paul Katz:

What I don't want to do is; I don't want to start making policy decisions. I want you...yeah.

John Savino:

I agree

Paul Katz:

So I, so I don't want to share my politics. They have no place here. I'm here to just tell you that my review of the statute requires that input in both the development of grant criteria and policies as well as the distribution of funding to be run through AORCC. That's not to say that, you heard what the Director, Mr. Martyn had to say; he said he puts a lot of weight, heavy weight, upon what you folks who pay into that fund, have to say. And obviously, the Parks Board needs to be ultimately convinced as to how much weight they have to give your excellent and experienced recommendations and the experience of Fish and Game and Parks staff.

John Savino:

Ok, the Chair recognizes Pete.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Yeah, Mr. Katz, you said this was amended in 2011?

Paul Katz:

I can't, all I'm looking at is the credits it said credits added by laws 1965, chapter 68 section 1, amended by laws 1966 and then it goes on to tell you all of the, it's really amended by all those other laws, 1989 effective July 1st, 2012. I don't have each prior publication. We could do a historical investigation but this is the statute as it is sitting today and as it now reads irrespective of how it read in 1965.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Can you help us? Mr. Katz

Paul Katz:

Yes.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Can you help us determine if the language has changed in this, in any time recent?

Paul Katz:

I can look a little bit further...

Don French:

It says July 12.

Paul Katz:

What I did is pulled this out of Westlaw which is the Arizona Revised Statutes. And they have credits and annotations; it says under Section 7, the Legislature intends by this act to continue the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission to provide for the distribution of Federal and State monies for recreational projects and to assist and advise Arizona State Parks Board, and that was an amendment, or that was a statement of objectives from 1996. And then, if you'll then look, and I'm on page 2 where it now says, Section 3, Purpose of Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission, the purpose of the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Commission is to provide for the distribution of Federal and State monies for recreational projects and to assist and advise, the Arizona State Parks Board, and that was the laws of 1911 became effective became effective, I believe, July 1, 2012

Kent Ennis:

Mr. Katz?

Paul Katz:

Yes sir?

Kent Ennis:

This was originally drafted in '66?

Paul Katz:

'65 or '66

Kent Ennis:

Ok, because there probably wasn't an Off Highway Vehicle Fund then. So there's been some historical changes in this document. I'm just looking for the recent ones that have occurred in the last five or ten years and if we can find those and you can help us, beautiful.

Doris Pulsifer:

I'm not sure... but my guess is that the most recent change has to do with the Heritage Fund. Because AORCC used to, in addition to the land and water and state lake improvement they used to also review the Heritage Trails Grants and since that...

Doris Pulsifer:

That statute has been excised from the law. It's...

Pete Pfeifer:

Ok, can I be more specific here; I would like to know when the words "Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund" were added to this document. Can you guys help us find that?

Paul Katz:

I won't promise, I think that can be done. It's just that I'm going to have to probably, do an electronic search or go to our library and pull out old versions of the Arizona Revised Statutes. And I can tell you, probably tell you when that was adopted. I would assume that was not adopted until the funding existed.

Pete Pfeifer:

And that could have been in '89. This used to be a Governor appointed position, and the Off Highway Vehicle Fund came into being in the late '80s early '90s and I'd like to understand when this, when these words originally appeared in this document. Was it sometime recent, or has it always been there?

Paul Katz:

Again when I see the underlining, if you'll go back to the credits under paragraph 3, in blue, I didn't do, I did the yellow highlighting, but the blue is Laws, 1989 Chapter 193, Section 5, I have a feeling it may not have been, but I'm speculating, until 1989. It may have been earlier.

John Savino:

Ok, great, the chair recognizes...David.

David Moore:

I'm into my second term here, we've reviewed hundreds of grants, been involved with millions of dollars of distributions - today is the first time that this The Arizona Outdoor Recreation Commission that that term has been mentioned in any of the proceedings that I have attended. What is, where has it been and why are we hearing about it today, what has happened, that seems alarming to me, I don't you know, regardless of the fact that it may have been created in 1965, why have we been proceeding without, under their guidance, all of time that I've been involved until today. What's changed? It just seems very strange to me.

John Savino:

Chair recognizes Bob.

Robert Baldwin:

Mr. Chairman, Group, as you might recall, we kind of gone through this development of the OHVAG Commission and stuff, in recent meetings, the OHV Law was originally written in 1991 they also established the Off Highway Vehicle Group as a Governor appointed panel in 1991. Ok. In 1996 OHVAG was abolished by a Legislative action. The State Parks Board re-established OHVAG as an Advisory Group to The Parks Board appointed by the Parks Board. Ok, so at that time, I mean, that's why you're here now because The Parks Board decided to keep you and put you under their wing. So, and the original OHV Statute, had in the language that AORCC would be determining the distribution of funds, in original statute. That was changed when the law was amended back in 2008 and they replaced AORCC with The Parks Board at that time. Ok, but this particular statute has not been changed.

John Savino:

Ok, I guess to help you out with your question, then why all of a sudden Bob, is it being presented to us as, I can only guess, maybe that the change in Administration is looking you know, to right the wrong or what is the reason, that is one of the questions that David had, why now?

Kent Ennis:

Can I give you my impression, I can't give you a metaphorical answer, and the impression is that when I came into this job, we, the question was raised, and among all these discussions we've, that have been going on about OHVAG, what's the AORCC position in this, and it seems that not only in the spirit of having a wider input into the decisions that it appears there are many days that I wish I had my JD but I don't and never will, that not only in the spirit but also it appears in the fact that we should have been doing this all along, now, I'll get us in trouble or you already have, saying why wasn't this done before, and I cannot tell you that.

John Savino:

So, in a nut shell, you're telling us that this is the way it is right now until it's changed, you can't change it, I know none of us can. What, I'd like to move on with this and say that in order to change that we have to go onto higher steps and we'll proceed, pursue those steps to get it because we don't feel, the OHV community doesn't feel that this is right, but we have to take it to a higher authority than here.

Pete Pfeiffer:

In the packet that we were given, does it, is there a packet about the make-up of the organization? Who's on it?

David Moore:

Yes in the first section, right here.

John Savino:

Can I have my SB 1167 back when you're done with it, please?

Paul Katz:

Oh, sure.

John Savino:

When you're done.

Paul Katz:

No, I'm done with it.

Don French:

One more question for Bob? Mr. Chairman?

John Savino:

Yes, go ahead.

Don French:

That Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund, that's all the monies that comes from everywhere goes into this one fund, is that correct?

Robert Baldwin:

Mr. Chairman and Group, there's your summary on page 8 of your packet D.2.c.3 that is OHV revenues.

Don French:

RTP Sticker...everything.

Robert Baldwin:

No, it doesn't include Federal money; this is state OHV Recreation Fund revenue.

Kent Ennis:

But... Mr. Chairman is it possible he's asking the question of where, this is our portion of the OHV money, is it ...

Robert Baldwin:

This is the whole thing. Well ADOT...

Kent Ennis:

But what about the part that goes to Game and Fish?

Robert Baldwin:

Well hey, ADOT gets a part, it's all on here. This is the whole thing. This is the whole distribution of funds. ADOT transfers to us and I know they make direct transfers to Game and Fish. We used to do that.

Kent Ennis:

Yeah, it's all here.

Robert Baldwin:

That is the OHV Fund.

Kent Ennis:

Game and Fish, State Land Department and State Parks

John Savino:

Except for the RTP money which is Federal, this is all State OHV money.

Kent Ennis:

That's right.

Don French:

So..., that Recreation Fund, the RTP money they can't review? I guess that's what I'm trying to establish is this, what the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund is?

Kent Ennis:

Is it RTP as well as gas tax money, or?

Robert Baldwin:

No, the OHV Recreation Fund is only State money.

Don French:

So, that's the only part that they can review, according to this?

Robert Baldwin:

Well, according to Statute that's what they're designated to review. The RTP came along after all these things were established and is not included in any State's statutes. However, the State Parks Director is designated by the Governor to administer the RTP Program. And it doesn't say Parks Board, it says State Parks Director. There hasn't been a definitive document that says what how he wants to do that but it's fallen under the administration of the Parks Board along with other grant programs. So, it's kind of floating out there but because we do include it in the OHV structure, it's included with review under the OHV Projects and we're now offering grants for Recreational Trails Program, or for non-motorized projects, that will be going through AORCC and the Parks Board for that to be approved there.

John Savino:

Ok, in order to change this, is that part of SB 1167 or is this, is it a State statute that ...

Paul Katz:

It would be new Legislation to amend Arizona Revised Statutes Section 41 511.25 and again just one other comment, is that this establishes what mandatorily must be reviewed, if a particular State Agency that is doing a grant distribution relating at least to outdoor recreational activities, I believe at least arguably, AORCC could be asked if they were willing to review grant criteria or give their expertise but, I really don't know that with certainty. The Statute does not discuss Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund, but the comments indicate that both in the 1985 and 2011 comments, again that the purpose of the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission is to provide for the distribution of federal and state monies for recreational projects and to assist and advise the Arizona State Parks Board, so, I think that they may have discretion to assist and advise The Arizona State Parks Board with respect to developing grant criteria or awarding grants even if it wasn't specifically from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund.

John Savino:

Ok, Pete

Pete Pfeiffer:

Just one other comment, I'm not trying to beat a dead horse or anything like that. Could you Mr. Katz or Bob, send me an e-mail or a document that basically says how this came about as far as the law was drafted in 1966 that kind of has the timeline sorted out? Because people are going to want to know, they really are going to want to know...

John Savino:

They are up in arms right now about this change where...

Pete Pfeiffer:

Well, they're just like us, uninformed and just kind of "what, where did this come from"? So, it's our obligation to our constituents to at least brief them as to how this whole thing came about.

Paul Katz:

Understood and without taking, and I'll be happy to try to research that for you if I possibly...

Pete Pfeiffer:

Well, I think that Bob had it pretty well dialed in.

Paul Katz:

Well, that's fine.

John Savino:

Yeah.

Pete Pfeiffer:

All I need is it in writing.

John Savino:

The history of it...

Paul Katz:

But, one thing that I would emphasize too is that The Parks Board obvious, you have a specific mission and goal, The Parks Board has pressure, not only from OHVAG but pressure from the conservationists, pressure from hunters, and I understand that we're talking about largely money from the stickers and how that money gets used, but how we use Park Lands even for off-highway vehicle use, does effect farmers and ranchers and hunters and fishermen and birdwatchers, so their responsibility is to the general public and is broader than your focus. I don't comment today as to who's right or wrong, or how we put that all in balance, but I don't think that you need to be frightened that The Parks Board is all of a sudden flip its middle finger at you...

John Savino:

No, where I'm...

Pete Pfeiffer:

No, we're worried about our constituents...will see this as we're being diluted.

Don French:

It's a big change...

Pete Pfeiffer:

Once again the voice of the public is being diluted one more time.

Don French:

It's big...

Pete Pfeiffer:

Which, I'm not saying that's the truth, I'm just saying that's the perception.

Paul Katz:

I understand, and the only reason I brought that up is that when you try to define the public, it gets to be fairly broad and The Parks Board itself gets torn between different...

John Savino:

I understand that but to address the Advisory...right.

Paul Katz:

And if you want to pursue as private citizens, the lobbying of the Legislature, to change the law, that's your absolute right...

John Savino:

Right, thank you...

Paul Katz:

...As a citizen of the State of Arizona.

John Savino:

Alright, well thank you for your presentation. To address the Advisory Group: It's a, it will be a moot point, we need to find out why so we can answer to our constituents, but it will be a moot point if they just take it and don't pass, you know, don't go forward with it. The process as I see it; is that the grant comes to us, we review it, we say yea or no... you know

Pete Pfeiffer:

We rate it.

John Savino:

We rate it and we give the recommendation. If we, where the problem's going to come is, if there's an environmental issue there that they're trying to push through, if that grant comes as far as us and it, we vote it down, and then they turn around and approve it. That's where we're going to run into the problem. We haven't gotten there yet, in the mean time, we're going to try to find a way to change this on the outside. Not as an Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group, but just as individuals. So, is there any other questions before we move on on that? Thank you very much.

All right...we did the budget already, Chairman's report; let's go on to the chairman's report.

D. REPORTS – may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects:

3. Chairman's Report:

The Chair will report on a meeting with State Parks Executive Director Bryan Martyn held in the morning before the OHVAG meeting.

John Savino:

At 9 o'clock this morning, Don French, Pete Pfeiffer, and myself had a meeting with the new Director. I have to say, that going into the meeting, I didn't have our hopes very high. I felt that we'd just get another political run-around from a politician and we wouldn't get anywhere. When I came out of the meeting, I felt good. That we would get someplace with it; we're, we'd get back with staff, on an equal term and that we would both respect each other and move on with life and get these things done. The Director told me, and I'm not going into all the issues but we...he's going to address The Ambassador Program and a lot of the other issues that we have. Basically, in a nutshell of having the respect that we should have, and have the voice that we should have, this puts a little bit of a damper into it on this because we find out that we have another group involved in this thing that's a non-motorized group. So, that changes stuff but, the law, I trust our Representative from the Attorney General's Office on what the law says and what the law says we have to go by until that law is changed. We hope that, and I do have a good feeling from the Director, that when he said and what he said in front of us, that he is, you know, he's going to look at the OHV Community and our wishes and take that into consideration. So, that's basically all I have to say on that issue. And we, it's a Chairman's Report so, I can't, we can't have a discussion on it, correct?

Paul Katz:

You are supposed to just report what occurred and your observations and if anybody that wasn't present has questions of you they can certainly ask you what happened, and or what your impressions are, but you ought not be get into a debate if we want to in a future meeting do that, but these minutes will reflect what you reported and if any of the members of the Advisory Group weren't present, and have questions, or want you to clarify anything, feel free to do so.

John Savino:

Ok, all two of you, do you have questions?

E. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS

1. Approve minutes from the June 1, 2012 meeting.

John Savino:

No, ok great we'll go on then. At this point, with the minutes and knowing that we just got these, one of our members, Thomas just received these this morning, another member, Pete just received it last night when he got home from Kingman. And we didn't have ample amount of time, I received mine Wednesday evening, we didn't have ample amount of time to do the minutes so I would like to entertain a motion that we postpone, we table these minutes, the approval of those, and talking to the Director, as you mentioned again, we'd like to have, he doesn't want it to go three months before we get to these, I would like to table these until, and pick out a date to come back and meet to approve these minutes, review, and give you guys time to review these minutes and approve them, and also, with that said, the evaluation form, I too would like to have that tabled and come back, so with those two, I'd like to set a meeting within the next thirty days to go and review those things. So, any suggestions on the date?

David Moore:

I would be available like on the...

John Savino:

Do, one way to handle that rather than sitting here and trying to all figure it out, we'd never get anywhere with that. Can we instruct or request...

Pete Pfeiffer:

Can we make a motion within the next thirty days?

John Savino:

Doris to do to us?

Paul Katz:

I believe you could move to table approval of last meeting's minutes and be specific, I don't recall, is that June Bob?

Robert Baldwin:

June 1st.

Paul Katz:

June 1st? Motion to table the approval of the meeting of June 1st 2012.

Robert Baldwin:

Maybe they should go to the next agenda item and determine the next meeting date and then they can go back and table the item.

G. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETINGS AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Friday, November 2, 2012 at a location to be determined.

John Savino:

Ok, let's go to agenda item #G. Let's do it and we have to do it within the next...

David Moore:

Thirty days you said.

John Savino:

Thirty days, there about.

Don French:

Yeah, no more than thirty days.

John Savino:

So...

Pete Pfeifer:

What does the 28th look like for this month?

David Moore:

Is the next meeting a special meeting, or...a regular meeting?"

Don French:

Special

David Moore:

That's what I thought.

John Savino:

Does anybody have any suggestions?

Pete Pfeifer:

Hey John, are you going to be in town on the 28th?

John Savino:

Oh, on the 27th. Yes, yes the 27th the... the 27th yes. I am.

August- wow the 27th I have a meeting at the Senators office at 1:00. Can we have the meeting that morning on August 27th? How does that work for you guys?

Don French:

What day is that?

John Savino:

It's on Monday, August 27th

David Moore:

Ok... yes

John Savino:

You ok? You ok?

Thomas McArthur:

I don't know, I'm not techie, so, I don't have my calendar with me. I would need to check on that.

John Savino:

Ok.

Pete Pfeifer:

Ok, so I would like to make a motion that we table the June 1st 2012 minute meetings, the approval of those until Monday August 27th 2012.

John Savino:

Ok there's been a motion on the floor.

David Moore:

Seconded

John Savino:

Seconded, any discussion? No, all those in favor?

Group:

Aye

John Savino:

All those opposed?

Thomas McArthur:

Silence... abstained.

Group voted to hold a special meeting on Monday, August 27, 2012 @ 9am.

John Savino:

So we have four, David, Don, John and Pete in favor of it. And now I have to ask staff, is that ok with you on that date? You don't have a golf tournament do you Bob?

Robert Baldwin:

I will be in Scotland, golfing my little butt off.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Well, good for you!

Don French:

Well, good for you! Scotland! Wow!

Doris Pulsifer:

Is this a meeting only for the minutes?

E. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS

2. OHVAG Will Discuss and Recommend Changes to the OHV Project Evaluation Form. – Staff developed a project evaluation form that provides a quantitative analysis of projects based on the priorities for project selection identified in the off-highway vehicle statute A.R.S. §28-1176(E-H) and the State Trails Plan. The evaluation form was used to rate grant projects in the last funding cycle. OHVAG used the form and now may suggest additions, deletions and/or changes to the form. The discussion may include recommendations on project application requirements and considerations for funding future projects, such as a maximum project award and proof of user community support. The Group will make a recommendation to staff as to how the revised criteria should be used to determine priority in awarding grant funds.

John Savino:

No, it's not just for the minutes; we're tabling the grant grading form. At the same time we're going to go through both. And what I'd like to do since we're tabling both of them, I'd like to have, instruct our, request our members to review...after our discussion with Bryan this morning, he felt strongly that this is our rating form. And so with that said, this is our rating form, we need to get busy on this and come up with the rating form for us. And we carry this on for a year...

Pete Pfeifer:

Do I have to amend my motion then because all I talked about was the minutes?

John Savino:

No, I want to take care of both.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Ok, so I should...just

John Savino:

The rating form too.

Robert Baldwin:

The motion was for minutes only, why don't you just taken care of.

Paul Katz:

And make a second motion if you think appropriate motion to table discussion of the grant rating form until that same meeting.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Ok, so I'm going to make, I guess two motions.

Paul Katz:

Well, the first one was already passed.

Pete Pfeiffer:

Ok, ok

Paul Katz:

So, you just need to move to table the discussion of the grant rating form until our...

Pete Pfeiffer:

Meeting on August 27th

Paul Katz:

Special meeting of August 27th

Pete Pfeiffer:

Ok, I'd like to make a motion that we table the discussion of the rating form until our next meeting on Monday, August 27th 2012.

John Savino:

Is there a second?

Don French:

Second.

John Savino:

Ok, all in favor?

Group:

Aye.

John Savino:

All opposed? None? It's been passed.

Don French:

It's going to work out all right.

John Savino:

Ok, so we're going to take care of those two issues...

Don French:

What time is the meeting?

John Savino:

The meeting will be at; I've got that other meeting at the State Capital Building.

Don French:

At One

John Savino:

That's at 1:00.

Don French:

It's going to take some time to hash all this out.

John Savino:

Can we make it at 9:00? 9:00 am in the morning? So that we... Bob?

Kent Ennis:

Can we have it here if Bob's not here?

John Savino:

Are you not going to be here Bob?

Kent Ennis:

He's golfing he said.

Don French:

Will you cancel your vacation for us?

John Savino:

PGA Tournament's going on this weekend not then.

Robert Baldwin:

That's why we had rushed this meeting in and we've got AORCC next week and it has to be ready for the Parks Board by the 20th and that agenda has to be two weeks ahead of time for them. And you know, I'm gone for the next two weeks so I mean, it's difficult to get things all put together when they're all jumping around like this all the time.

John Savino:

I can appreciate that, but I also you have to appreciate that we haven't had time to look at this and we need to have, we're not going to carry on with this meeting until we look at that stuff, it's only fair to the members.

Pete Pfeifer:

Is there somebody that can sub for you Bob?

Robert Baldwin:

Yeah, Doris is in charged she developed it in the first place. So she...

Pete Pfeifer:

Doris, will that work for you?

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah.

John Savino:

Ok we're going to go on with it then. Then the motion has been moved and seconded and passed and that's it. O.K. so, is there any other at this point...

Paul Katz:

Just a point of order, I don't know whether or not we need have a motion to set a special meeting for this board or group for August 27th 2012.

John Savino:

We can cover it anyway, that way just to cover our bases.

Paul Katz:

I'm just making the suggestion; I don't think we'll get punished if we don't.

Don French:

The Director is the one who mandated that we have it in thirty days, so...

John Savino:

Yeah, yeah sure.

Robert Baldwin:

Alright, we need confirmation of a quorum. And Monday the packets will be going out again for two week notice. So, no quorum no meeting.

John Savino:

Gotcha

Kent Ennis:

I mean we can set a specific date for on that date or the earliest available date within thirty days from the??

John Savino:

All right.

Robert Baldwin:

All right, the Ambassadors are going to be here at 2:00 o'clock. There is something we can go over here today, for discussion, I mean there's no action necessary on this but I think I've explained it to you before; and its part of the rating process, so it's just some background information for you, if you want to take a minute and take a look at this.

It's something to consider between now and then. This was sent out in your packet, and basically the purpose of going through this right now is to help you understand the grant application process. And what we're asking them to provide us with when they make an application for funding. Ok, so their project is going to identify what work they want to do, all right, that work is divided into Scope Items. And it's all put together here on what we call an estimated project sheet. So on the left side, you have all the different Scope Items that they're going to include in their project and on the right side they're going to tell you how they're going to pay for them, what it's going to cost them. Now, on the, in the Scope Item column, we ask them to identify their Scope Items based on the rating criteria. Ok? So, if we go back to the rating criteria sheet, the first item here; Level 1 Priority says Protect Access, Acquire Land so if they have a Scope Item that does that, they put in here what that Scope Item is and how it meets the requirements of that activity. Right down here in this section says: The actions that help and protect access, implement more comprehensive planning, permanently secure access to designated trails and routes, consider trails access urban area parking etc.etc. So this is the State Trails Plan criteria. That needs to be considered when evaluating a project. To do that, they have told us that they're going to get an easement from Rancher Smith, to cross his property. In return for that easement they have to install two cattle guards one on each end of the property so that gates don't get left open etc. Ok, so their project includes a Scope Item that protects access to trails and acquires land for public access. Is that clear, any questions on that? All right so, they go through this whole process doing that same thing. The next item is: Maintain Renovate Existing Trails. So they have a Scope Item that says "renovate trails" it's going to cost them \$53,000 and it also says "and mitigate any resource impacts by the trail." So the renovation of the trail includes closing these mines; this could probably be under the mitigation Item but at least they have an Item that says they're going to maintain, renovate trails. All right and back over here on your cost sheet, renovate trails \$61,000. Yes sir?

Don French:

Just a comment. This seems very complicated and cumbersome. I'm wondering if this is going to discourage potential grant people from going through, you know to go take that effort to go through this if it's that, I'm wondering if that's going to be a deterrent for them.

John Savino:

Bob, one of the, if I may interject, one of the, do you remember when we came up with the SB1167, the sticker program. One of the things we did, rather we wanted to streamline the process, the grant rating process, it was too cumbersome the way it was with the, with RTP money. It was this thick, you had one year to do it, you know you only reviewed at it one time a year. We said, "in order to get this money out, which we always talk about, get it out to the people, that we wanted to streamline it and make it as easy as possible for the grantee/grantor/grantees to apply for it and we want to make it as frequent as possible; that's why we do it any time they come in and as easy as

possible; and are we getting away from that? There's a lot of stuff that's necessary, that you have to have in here, but are we getting away from that first idea.

Robert Baldwin:

Well, first of all, the grant application process never changed. They have to identify what they want to spend the money on. Ok, so they have to do this whether it's applied to criteria or not. They have to tell us, they can't just say "well I want \$100,000 and I'll, we'll go fix this trail and we'll go put this over there, this, that and the other thing. They can't do that; they have to identify what they're going to build, and how much it's going to cost and where the funds are coming from. Do they want reimbursement for it, is their going to be match for it, etc. etc. That's all we're doing with this cost breakdown sheet. Those have always been a part of any grant application.

Don French:

Yeah, I'm, I'm sure it's necessary, I'm sitting here trying to understand it as your going along and it's complicated.

Kent Ennis:

It's... How they justify...their grant

Don French:

Right, but it's...It is getting more complicated and I'm thinking of if I want to apply for a grant to starting this process and Oh my God...forget it!

Robert Baldwin:

You're talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Don French:

Oh, could be 50 or...

Robert Baldwin:

You need to be accountable for it

Don French:

Oh yeah

Robert Baldwin:

They need to be accountable for it. I mean they need to describe what they're going to do with the money. That's all this is, is when you put out a bid for a contractor to come build you a house, you know, this is what he does. He breaks it down, he says roofing supplies this much; concrete dad a dad a da...he tells you it's going to cost you \$200,000.

John Savino:

So basically what you're, in a nutshell, you tell us this is a necessary evil that we have to go through to do it and that's understandable. Ok?

Robert Baldwin:

Okay, now the other side of the equation is that you are required to look at the trails plan criteria to evaluate whether or not they are providing high priority, any high priority needs. Correct? You all agree to that?

Robert Baldwin:

That's in the first column to the left, that's on the, that's on the criteria page. So how do you know if they are meeting a certain criteria? What is your, what is your water line to say that they are acquiring access, that they are acquiring access to trails, or protecting access to trails? What is your.....

John Savino:

You know what my biggest issue with that first page on this thing that you have, that one there, is that we experienced this with the last grant. When you have that questioner out there Game and Fish for instance, Game and Fish in every one of their categories they put yes. It was for and a survey to go out and see about how many OHVs were out there in the field. That doesn't in my mind as a matter of interpretation that doesn't, that's not mitigating land and stuff like this. Somewhere down the road maybe it could, you know add in up there but that's a far reach, so, it's a matter of interpretation they went down and yes on all that stuff. And that's, I have a problem with that, that's where my big issue on that whole form there is. If that was left off there, on yes or no on the thing, and if it just had, if they answered, the Ranchers Smith have agreed to ya know, that part there without the yes and no because that's going to you know in my mind is going to come back and bite us and they say, hey we met all this stuff and you guys say no.....

Robert Baldwin:

In their project description, by telling us how they are going to spend the money, they've identified what the scope of work is and if the scope of work is to conduct a survey, which means they, you know they develop questions, they show up at certain locations, and ask people those questions, they gather the information, they analyze it and put it in a report, and they want a \$100,000 to do it. What in that process meets this requirement? Nothing, right?

Robert Baldwin:

Okay, and when we evaluated that grant we didn't give them any points for this in fact we didn't give them any points for anything except

John Savino:

Two points, they only get two points.

Robert Baldwin:

Two points in one category. So that is your job when you are evaluating these grants to say, how does this project meet this criteria? And they have provided information about what they are doing, and from your experiences from doing these and looking at these projects and looking at the variety of projects that you're getting in, you know you see, oh this project definitely does that, they describe that item, renovate trails and they said that they are going to spend this money, that's very clear. Now this guy wants to put his Scope item in that category and it doesn't really say that, he's not really renovating trails

so it doesn't belong there. Is there another criterion where it belongs? Probably, but that's what the process is about, they describe the project, you determine how it rates to the priorities in the State trail plans and in the OHV statute.

Don French:

And I think if I may, again, that's the problem that I see with this whole process now these are getting where it's going to take us, it's going to take a couple of hours for me to go through each project that we have and sometimes we have 10 or 12 projects, and go through and give an honest evaluation and look at the stuff and come back and turn it in and maybe accepted or it may not. There's three other people reviewing it, so it you know it's.....

Robert Baldwin:

But after you do a few of these it gets pretty clear, does it protect access or doesn't it? Does it develop a new trail or doesn't it?

John Savino:

Bob, but one thing and we're having a conversation, a good conversation here, getting back to the AORCC thing if I may, we go through this thing we get this, we take time, it takes two hours to go through this thing because what you do you not only look at theirs and say this is what their app saying, here is what they are saying they want to do, it may entail calling somebody, calling Jeff Gursh and saying hey, and talking for 20 or 30 minutes on the phone on this one subject. So you are covering all that stuff going through there now at the same time I guarantee you, I can't promise you this, but AORCC doesn't have the time to sit there and go through that and that same process and so what we're... This is a necessary evil, we have to do that. But the time that it takes to do that to review it that is so extensive, and I'm going to get back with the thing with the AORCC, we can't do anything about that.

Robert Baldwin:

Now, this, this is the way...

John Savino:

To make it better.

Robert Baldwin:

This is the way; this is the way that the grant program has run for

David Moore:

For a long time

Robert Baldwin:

Forever, we did all this work, we got staff, and we got somebody to come in, and we sat down there and we spent 2 hours per grant running through this stuff. And then we brought you a recommendation and here's how we think this scored. Okay? And now you are saying that you want to evaluate the project. So how, so how are you going to evaluate it? You need to evaluate it based on the criteria and the structure that we established for grant projects.

Don French:

Careful what you ask for, you might get it.

Robert Baldwin:

Amen.

John Savino:

Any other questions on this?

David Moore:

I have a minor question along the second part of this, which is on this sheet. We tried doing it before and we had some problems with it and, and I still think that it exists, the all or nothing version of this scoring. It doesn't tell you anything.

John Savino:

I, I would like to get into that, first of all let's table that, that's part of next month's

David Moore:

All right.

John Savino:

That's some of the questions we need to, come, you guys need to come and think about, and come forward with on this thing. How to make this, this grading form, it's our form, the Director said that. Now, let's make it work for us, so let's come to the table with some good suggestions to get it on and I'm tired of it going on month after month after month.

David Moore:

I agree we...

John Savino:

Let's get this going because what we decide in that meeting on the 27th, he has to run forward go to and it's only fair to the grant people that are the applicants they have to know what the playing field is.

David Moore:

Right.

John Savino:

So we have to tell them what the playing field is.

David Moore:

Right.

Pete Pfeifer:

And we will get better at these grant evaluations with practice.

John Savino:

So, let's to any questions that you have on that let's table. Bob, do you have anything else on that?

Robert Baldwin:

Well let me just point out one other thing here. I mean this stuff; this first part is pretty cut and dry Scope items match with criteria.

David Moore:

Right, right, I hear ya.

Robert Baldwin:

And they identify with cost associated with those things.

David Moore:

Right.

Robert Baldwin:

The other part that we wanted your input on is are these bonus categories things. Which said, well first of all, the statute says that projects with multiple scope items should receive higher priority. Okay, that's in the statute. All right, so how do you, how do you award extra points if they have multiple scope items?

John Savino:

Isn't that part of this grant rating program that we are going to talk about next month?

Robert Baldwin:

I understand that, I am just getting you some information because, I will not be here next month and you need it while you are reading your packet next week and thinking about what I can do to change this.

Don French:

Gotcha.

Robert Baldwin:

All right, so that, so that was one of the criteria and this bonus 50% or more work is first level. So, it said the more high priority projects, and it said reward projects, with multiple scope items and the other one was it said that mitigation projects should have priority. So, how do you want to award extra points? How do you want to meet that part of this whole scheme of things? And then we said, okay, so what else is important to you guys? Here's multiple projects, and we said what else is important to you and you said, we want on the ground projects. All right, so there was a criteria for OHVAG on the ground projects, now that's kind of a general statement I think that we assigned that to trail renovation and new trail construction or something like that. You need to look at those criteria and say what is priority for you? This may say high priority in the state's trails plan, but that may not be a priority right now for you. So, out of those priority items, how do you want to identify what's important to you and award it more points? Now there's other issues that have come up since this was even done, for instances ya'll keep talking about the sticker fund money. Okay, that is part of the fund, okay, and when you talk about the sticker fund money that's generated by people that ride UTVs, ATVs, and dirt bikes. Okay? So, how many land managers, how many projects, are going on the ground out there for strictly ATV, UTV, and dirt bikes? Not very many. Right?

David Moore:

Right.

Robert Baldwin:

If any. If someone comes in with a project that wants to do something like that then how would you award priority for that? In other words their building new trails, well their not building roads, their building 60 inch, and their building the single track, or whatever their doing.

Robert Baldwin:

How would you, how would you identify a bonus or make that a priority for you?

Don French:

I totally understand what you are trying to do there, make it as fair as possible, cover all bases, but, by doing that you complicate the form and I don't know which is best. Like I said try to make the perfect form that compensates for everything that's so complicated that nobody wants to fill out or.

Pete Pfeifer:

All they were talking about, I remember joy talking about this, is this...

Don French:

I know, I know

Pete Pfeifer:

We can weight it towards things that we prefer, and we can change this, it's never written in stone, we can modify it. Prior to the next.....

Robert Baldwin:

You have to be able to identify, for the applicants... Where they, where they are going to get there points and how they're going to score favorably.

What is your, what is your priorities? If we want to write a project that we know will get support from OHVA funded, it better meet some of your priorities. What are those priorities and what do I need to identify in my project so those priorities are met. I met my, I identified those Scope item, that relates to the criteria that you have identified as high priority.

Don French:

And that's something that's going to have to be in our discussion to its like simplicity over fairness, I mean trying to make...

Pete Pfeifer:

Can we get rid of all the bonus stuff and just go with what the statute says, just to simplify it? Or we can look at weighting it one way or another.

David Moore:

I think that a lot of things will slip through if you do that.

Robert Baldwin:

As you look at a project and you break it down, you look at the scope items and say what are they building with this scope item? Okay? And what criteria does that satisfy? And is that high priority criterion or a lower priority criterion? But you need to have some quantitative measure to put all that stuff together and say out of all that stuff they proposed, this project scored this way. And it could include your preferences.

David Moore:

One of the things that Brian mentioned was that he wanted us to establish some minimum deals. How do you feel, you know about that, as far as a way that, you know a minimum number, a minimum particular item you know that covers, or whatever for us to discuss and come up with a list.

Robert Baldwin:

You can make it cut and dry and say if it doesn't score 10 points then we won't fund it. But then again you know there may be a project that you like.

And if you cut off your nose to spite your face then you can't fund it.

David Moore:

Right, I agree.

David Moore:

He wanted these. One of the things that he said this morning was to establish a minimum of

Don French:

He seemed to like that concept, but I am not sure that I do

David Moore:

Right.

Robert Baldwin:

Well we've kind of had that before and it's difficult in this process because if all they want to do is trail maintenance then okay, that's a very important thing going out there and cleaning water bars and making a trail passable, and making sure the blow down is off the trails and stuff like that.

Don French:

And it's \$10,000 dollars instead of

Robert Baldwin:

You can spend a lot of money to that but.

David Moore:

Right.

Robert Baldwin:

But how is that going to score? I mean it's one item, I mean it shouldn't be a matter of how they are scoring it should be..

David Moore:

I agree completely.

Robert Baldwin:

You kind of have to look at the whole thing. You got to be able to identify where are they spending the money.

David Moore:

Right

John Savino:

I know that the one thing that stuck with me was the conversation with Brian was that when we do, if you do score then that for instance and less say that it comes in at 5 points cause it's just or 8 points just for trail maintenance and we want to pass it through then we need to have our ducks lined up and you need to come to this meeting with your reasons why. And so we can get it down is what we are caught with here is we so no here, we only have so much time, and to write down that, you know all those reasons why is hard. So, if we have that with us ahead of time then we can proceed with it.

Doris Pulsifer:

Another thing to think about drawing the line, and to be above the line, and below the line projects as far as scoring say, 50 or above, or 49 and below don't get rating.

Or don't get awarded, then this system it's very difficult for any of the projects to rate say 100% because there's a lot of variables.

David Moore:

Right.

Doris Pulsifer:

So it's going to be real difficult to say well if the project gets say there's 100 points, you're not going to have any, you can tell from when we rated before that you are not going to have projects that are going to rate that high. They are all going to rate you know 49 or 50, I think we may have had, what we had one that was.

David Moore:

61

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah, 61 was the highest and yet there's like a 100, 100 points possible so, that's going to be another thing that will make it difficult to set an above the line, below the line. The below the line is going to have to be really low if we are going to do that.

Don French:

Why would you tie your hands like that?

Doris Pulsifer:

Well it's because in our other, as Bob was mentioning in our other grant program we use that for our strategic plan and it worked because we didn't have these scenarios

Don French:

So many variables.

Doris Pulsifer:

We didn't have all these priorities

Robert Baldwin:

Everybody had a possibility of getting 100%.

Doris Pulsifer:

Yeah.

John Savino:

See I thought, I thought before when we did programs we came into it and at one time we said, can we have \$1.2m dollars available but in reality we only have \$900,000 because state parks board said that they want to hold back so much in reserve, whatever the numbers were. Okay? And so we knew that we had that to work with then we went through, well, not all of the projects that we awarded, rated them, we got down to the last few and there wasn't enough money in the pot to fill those so what we did was we carried these over, we were supposed to carry those over. So, I thought in the rating thing if we have the money sitting there and we approve it, say yes or no, no matter what the thing is if the money is in there then they should be approved. Cause a yes or no, no matter what the rating is, the rating system to me in my mind, now is just is according if you don't have you don't have enough money. You go and you take the first priority, the second, third, fourth, but if you have ten projects and you have an over abundance of money then and we approve those thing then all of them should be approved.

Don French:

That would be a good argument against putting the lower cut-off on them.

John Savino:

You approve them all unless we say as a group and one thing that has come up to me in the past and said our January or February meeting we have x amounts of grants and we only have so much in the pot I don't, myself don't want to use all that up right then because what if. The next grant cycle, you know the next three months from then. We have a great grant come up that we really want to push through and all of a sudden we don't have the money for it. We need to; we need to come up with some type of criteria on what we keep in reserve.

Robert Baldwin:

We also need to realize that this \$1.9m that we have this year, that's accumulated and sitting there, that's not obligated. We are also going to accumulate another, about \$1.4m that will be available at this time next year. If we spend all that other money, and we have RTP money to help leverage that. So we don't have any problem getting to many projects.

John Savino:

Except for the fact that you know you mentioned earlier that these projects, these eight projects that were funded this last go around that was what \$900,000 or \$700,000? So if

in reality we don't have these, we already voted on that, we don't have \$1.9m sitting in there we only have 1... Whatever it is.

Robert Baldwin:

But whenever these projects come in, if we have projects that we want to fund then we can say we will fund them after July 1st. Okay. Because we know that the money will be there at that time.

John Savino:

Okay, gotcha.

Don French:

So that's next July?

Robert Baldwin:

Next July, I mean actually the money is available immediately. I mean the money, we are accumulating the money, and we could give it out at that time. Well depends on what administrative staff and Parks Board want to do.

I mean in the past that's the way we always did it. But, the problem was then we had a million dollars sitting in a fund and whenever the legislator was looking for money they were like "oh you have some money over here," you know.

So we tried to get it out the door faster by giving it out as it came in. And so we're behind the curb on that again.

We've got \$1.9m sitting in that fund and it's getting bigger every day, every month. Okay? So those are the..

John Savino:

Can't you tell that, I mean does it have to look, in my mind, we sent you on to the board, the State Parks Board with the approval of these, and got the approval from these last grants, at the June meeting. Aren't these approved? Now can't you take that money out of there? I mean as far as on paper...

Robert Baldwin:

Right, yes.

John Savino:

So when the State Legislator looks at it they see that there is not 1. Something, there is only..

Robert Baldwin:

Right. They will be obligated we'll reduce that available balance. But, the money still sits there until they spend it and get reimbursed.

John Savino:

I know, yeah, and.

Robert Baldwin:

So the fund still has, you know it probably has more than \$1.9m in it. That's what's available right now, the rest is obligated for projects.

You know they always see what's in the fund and that's what's happening with some of our other projects is they said we don't care if the bottom of the projects, cancel them and we will take, we'll take the money.

And that leaves the project sponsor high and dry.

And that's why we also started giving advances on these things to get the money out of that thing. So I mean we are trying to do everything that we can to protect the fund and what's sitting there. The big issue is give me some projects, give me something that you want see done and the other point on this is any time your decision you know goes against any legislator or whatever, limitation then you put the justification into it.

John Savino:

Right

Robert Baldwin:

And then that's part of the process.

Don French:

That's what we are talking about we need to have that justification.

Robert Baldwin:

Right. And this part of the sheet is what you guys need to look at these criteria here, and that over and above the basic how can we give them points in addition to what they've identified as the meeting criteria. All the stuff on the left is not going away that's the statute, so that's the criteria. All right?

John Savino:

Thank you very much. Don, you have a question?

Don French:

Yeah Bob, I was just thinking you know those, that first page that we have to fill out with 8 or 0, I guess I'm just asking your opinion sort of. Is that something for us? So it's not black and white? Can we put that like a 1 to an 8 and all of us assign a number to it and come and average that number and put a number like that in rather than.

Robert Baldwin:

You can do that, except you're really opening a can of worms when you say up to 8 points. Because then you really have to, then you have to figure out, okay so what am I going to base a 1 on? What am I going to base a 2 on? What am I going to base a 5 on?

Don French:

It's a way of averaging the group, that's the only thing that I'm thinking of

Robert Baldwin:

Well I understand that, but then again that diminishes from the priority of that component to, if it's a high level component it's supposed to get more consideration than a lower level priority. So basically on first level you could go for a 5 to 8, there could be scored there, then that's going to be higher than a second level. But then again you need to be consistent.

John Savino:

A 1 in that first category

Don French:

I would be for that, a 5 to 8

John Savino:

And a 5 to 8

Robert Baldwin:

And you can change those amounts in those categories that's another thing that we've asked you guys to consider what how much priority should a first level priority get? And then you can get those numbers and say how far is that above the second priority are those and we want to make increments in there so if it's not an 8 then is it a 5? But it has to be higher than the next component, but I mean you are talking about complicating things you are just adding levels of stuff there and that's even what we did for your, for your OHVAG consideration cause you said up to 5 points. What's it take to get up to 5 points?

David Moore:

Right.

Robert Baldwin:

And you need to quantify that; it can't just be a warm fuzzy thing. If it's a dollar figure then in this example here you use a percent of project cost for those things that's why you need to have those cost breakdown sheets and have that stuff all categorized so you can say how much of this scope item, what is that value towards the total project cost, what percent of the project cost is that? And that's easy to figure out. It's not rocket science. And it all starts with having that project cost sheet laid out properly with the figures in there and then you just apply it to this sheet. What goes where and how you want manipulate those items and numbers. Okay? Any questions?

John Savino:

Thank you Bob. We need to, even if you may not be here next time. Thomas, please do me a favor and we need your input.

Thomas McArthur:

Of course I will

John Savino:

At least we will have that to go by.

Don French:

This is really important

Paul Katz:

Another thing if somebody can't be physically here that they be available by phone.

John Savino:

Alright, at this point Bob do you have anything else on that?

Robert Baldwin:

No.

John Savino:

I would like to have Chris and Marge come up for your presentation this is on, I don't even know where I am anymore.

Robert Baldwin:

On reports on the bottom of the second page of the agenda.

D. REPORTS – may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects:

2. Staff Reports:

f. Representatives from the OHV Ambassador Program will give an update on the events and program accomplishments.

John Savino:

Okay. Representatives from the Off Highway Vehicle Ambassador Program update on the events and program accomplishments. Before you get started I would like to make a comment that I appreciate all the emails that we are getting on, when you are having meetings and what have you even though I haven't been able to get out there and attend them because it's to dang hot.

Marge Dwyer:

We agree.

John Savino:

I appreciate it.

Marge Dwyer:

Sure. Happy to have you whenever you can come.

John Savino:

Great.

Chris Gammage:

So we put together a couple of handouts for you. The first one goes over the accomplishments so far this fiscal year. So that's the first page, the second one is the upcoming events; this will be just tentative events. This doesn't include all of them, just what the agencies actually working right now, well not working, but having this season.

We haven't heard from Phoenix District office yet because it's too hot down there so they haven't started scheduling anything, also with the Tucson office. So, they will be getting things up and rolling as soon as it cools off a little down in the valley area. And the last sheet are the expenditures for this fiscal year, the second page of the board accomplishments, of course outreach is on that third page.

Marge Dwyer:

And we have a training coming up.

Chris Gammage:

Of course, right. So we can either go through it line by line or, you guys want to look through it real quick and ask your questions, either way. We do have another voluntary training coming up; we're probably going to do it mid October. So we are actively recruiting statewide. We're going to hold this next training; we're actually going to do it for the first time, at RideNow Power Sports out in Peoria. We are going to use their conference room, so it will be a little bit different. Kind of get it out of the agency setting and the actual user setting.

Don French:

So is RideNow getting up, are they in the program?

Chris Gammage:

Yes

Marge Dwyer:

They did receive the grant.

Chris Gammage:

They did receive the grant and we will be checking them in two weeks...

Marge Dwyer:

Yeah, we have a lead training. There are two types of training in the program and for those persons who take charge of the program and this case would be Right Now and their partner which is Arizona Game and Fish. They've investigated leads from each of the stores and the area where they are partnered. For example this is the first time where we have grant where we have partners who have more than one site that they're going to participate in. So RideNow is going to participate in, through their Peoria store so they're going to be working with the Northern and Western part of the valley and they will be working with Game and Fish over in that area because that's their partner. Then over on the East valley we have their Chandler store and their corporate headquarters that will be helping us with the Tonto and the TMR that's coming out there in Middle Gila and then we have the Tucson store, Danna Rhode's store, and we have Game and Fish involved in that as well. So, there are three sites involved that are involved in the Right Now/Game and Fish Grant. And so we have leads from each of those stores, and the Game and Fish Officers daily essence from each of those districts. Does anyone have concerns?

Don French:

Yeah. On one identity three locations

Marge Dwyer:

Right

Pete Pfeifer:

Question, what's happening down in Tucson? You said that their Right Now down on Oracle?

Marge Dwyer:

Yeah, the on the item roads store in Tucson, yeah in Tucson we wanted to break down in Tucson and they're going to help us down their along with Alan Forney and Joe Sacco with Game and Fish.

Pete Pfeifer:

Okay, and that will be in the fall sometime?

Marge Dwyer:

Yeah, definitely and we are going to start planning their events and that's part of the lead training as I said before on the 27th we're going to have the lead training. So the leads in each of those units will be coming together and learning their roles and responsibilities, they will be looking at maps and figuring out where they want to have events, what events with dreams that kind of thing.

Pete Pfeifer:

You have leads in Tucson?

Marge Dwyer:

Yeah

Marge Dwyer:

Yeah we have, are you familiar with...(Inaudible), Sean, Sean Brown out of the down the road store, Alan Forney out of the Game and Fish and anybody out of OHVAG that wants to help us recruit down there we really appreciate it.... (Inaudible).

Pete Pfeifer:

Okay, actually there's a good group down there that I can help you out with.

Marge Dwyer:

We will contact you. We will probably be setting up our main grant and recruiting effort through the down the Ina Road store and then as it gets cooler we'll be on-site, you know on the trails and we'll also be working with Tucson field office BLM down there on their land, and my intention is to get the Coronado involved as well.

Pete Pfeifer:

That might be, that might be a little more difficult.

Marge Dwyer:

We'll see what we can do, you'll hear from me.

Pete Pfeifer:

Are you guys going to the ATV Outlaw Jamboree? Up in Springerville.

Marge Dwyer:

We haven't gotten any information this year.

Pete Pfeifer:

That's the biggest thing going on for ATVS and stuff. I went to it last year, weeklong great event, and people from all over the country come and what not.

John Savino:

I've been, Bob's been up there with the Ambassador program, Chris has been up, they know and their familiar with it. This year it's way down on entries, it's like 80 something as opposed to the 300 something that they have had in the past.

Pete Pfeifer:

Okay, and then how did it go at the Overland Expo? Did you guys do pretty good?

Marge Dwyer:

Oh Wow!

Chris Gammage:

That was a neat event!

Marge Dwyer:

400 people that we talked to and we were the only ones there with maps.

Pete Pfeifer:

Good.

Marge Dwyer:

And any information about where to ride.

Thomas McArthur:

Made you popular.

Marge Dwyer:

Oh yeah.

Thomas McArthur:

Yeah, I wanted to hook up with you guys but, I was off in the sticks.

Marge Dwyer:

No problem, no problem.

Pete Pfeifer:

Did you guys talk to the Tour Tech guides?

Chris Gammage:

Yes!

Pete Pfeifer:

Those are the guys that I was out helping.

Chris Gammage:

Oh. That's nice

John Savino:

I would like to go through some of these finances. Let's compare quite a few things. You have here on 11/07/2011 you have an airbag installed for tow vehicle is that for a, what vehicle is that for? Is that for a Federal?

Chris Gammage:

It's a BML truck and it's the only truck that's used for the program

John Savino:

But it's actually a Federal truck?

Chris Gammage:

Right. It's a BML truck.

John Savino:

Okay. Now down two things. It says Cave Creek Ranger District trailer supplies, cleaning. That's for the trailer, for the Ambassador Program, the trailer.

Chris Gammage:

That's the trailer that is stored over at the Cave Creek Ranger station.

John Savino:

Now it says \$622 for a camera GPS for Cave Creek Ranger District, explain that. Is it for the Cave Creek Ranger District?

Chris Gammage:

It's for the Ambassador Program but it's stored at the Cave Creek Ranger District.

John Savino:

Okay. So it's different than for the Cave Creek Ranger District?

Chris Gammage:

No, it's OHV property we are just loaning it to them. So they're using that for the trail monitoring. So they'll take the GPS, they'll run the track logs and they'll take pictures of down signs and stuff.

Robert Baldwin:

We are not giving any money to the Cave Creek Ranger District.

Chris Gammage:

It all goes to me..

Robert Baldwin:

It's all going to Chris to operate that program so..

John Savino:

Yeah, I wish you would try to clarify because it didn't look good the way it's written it looks like it's going to a Federal Agency.

Chris Gammage:

Right, and actually this is just my tracking, so I just printed what I had, I didn't have time to change it for...

John Savino:

I just wanted to make sure and for you to make that clear.

Chris Gammage:

Yeah, I can make that change for the future.

John Savino:

On the second page stabilizer repair. What are you talking about there \$896?

Chris Gammage:

Yeah, the large Ambassador trailer has an electric stabilizer that comes down on the ends,

John Savino:

Jacks?

Chris Gammage:

It's got a jack on the front, when you disconnect it from the front then they have stabilizers that pop down and

John Savino:

What happened to those that it's \$896 to repair them?

Chris Gammage:

Yeah. The first set that were put on there did not work. So I think that they actually replaced them. So it actually should have said replacement not repair.

John Savino:

Okay, that's all the questions that I had.

Thomas McArthur:

I have a question. How are you utilizing SPOT?

Chris Gammage:

When we do a quartile patrol which is where the volunteers actually go out on their own they won't have an agency lead with them so that's how we check in and out with the agency. So when they get there they will get the okay, they'll check in and it comes back to me as well as somebody in the agency and they use that throughout the day to check in.

Robert Baldwin:

As opposed to agency radios which they didn't really want to.

John Savino:

Chris did we ever... You've got to bear with me, I'm 61, and I'm getting old, my memory. A while back when we had the one governing council meeting that I've been to in the last three years. Is that the only meeting that you had?

Chris Gammage:

That is the only governing meeting that we had, we are actually planning on getting one scheduled

John Savino:

I had posed the question, we had brought up the issue of the missing equipment or the, I don't know how to say it. Not missing equipment necessarily but unaccounted for equipment. Did we solve that? Did we come up with. Because at the time you said at the meeting and Bill Gibson did and you said we are going to do an audit on that.

I don't think that I saw the results of that audit in writing. It may have been a verbal thing, saying that we got it all taken care of but, I never saw the results of that audit. Is there results from that audit?

Chris Gammage:

We had an internal meeting within the agency, with the district manager and some of the law enforcement folks actually have that equipment. We sent State Parks a letter and we haven't received any.

John Savino:

So, that's still..

Chris Gammage:

That's still an issue, yes.

John Savino:

Is that an issue?

Chris Gammage:

Yes, Law enforcement is still using that equipment, for law enforcement OHV patrol and stuff. So, I don't have access to that stuff. But, it's not, I don't have access to that stuff.

John Savino:

So, that hasn't been resolved yet? Okay.

Chris Gammage:

We are getting a new District Manager in our office so some things will change.

John Savino:

It can go either to the better or the worst. Huh?

Chris Gammage:

We'll see.

John Savino:

Is that District Manager replacing Bill Gibson? No?

Chris Gammage:

No, this is the Phoenix District.

John Savino:

Okay, I understand. Is there any other questions?

Pete Pfeifer:

If you talk to Bill, this issue should have been resolved that's what I can't figure out.

John Savino:

I mean, I never saw anything that came he promised that in our governing, this was in our governing council meeting that we had. Don you were present for that as a visitor in the meeting. He flat, when I questioned that he promised that he would do an internal audit and yet we heard the results. I appreciate your honesty.

Chris Gammage:

The problem with working with our law enforcement folks is that they kind of work on their own.

Robert Baldwin:

Right, we know where the equipment is we just don't have access to it. It's not specifically, and if we had access we're not sure what we would do with it's not specifically, and we're not exactly sure what we would do with it.

John Savino:

That's neither here nor there, I just thought that, I was just wondering if I had missed something along the way.

Chris Gammage:

There was never any actual paperwork.

Robert Baldwin:

We are actually better off maintaining a smooth relationship with the Law Enforcement branch as opposed so that way they corporate and provide assistance in the program. I mean essentially remember when this program first started under Amy and Troy the law enforcement branch at the BLM office, a guy named John Young was the coordinator and he was the one that sent in all those purchasing orders to get all that stuff and he was in charge of all that stuff. So when he left, it's still law enforcement stuff and it doesn't have anything to do with the Ambassador program anymore, necessarily, and so that is where it sits.

John Savino:

Any other questions on that?

Pete Pfeifer:

We will remember this if they come back asking for more vehicles later on.

John Savino:

I would like to this somewhere in, if that's the case Bob then I'm not arguing with the fact on that then it needs to be written off. Equipment needs to be written off and we need to get on with life and learn from our mistakes or whatever, I would like to see end to that audit thing. Any other questions? I like everything that you've done and like I said I really feel the Ambassador Program is a strong program. There's some changes personally that I would like to see, but I commend you guys, both for your effort that you are doing.

Pete Pfeifer:

I just have a comment, I love what you guys are doing in the State, I think you are doing a fantastic job. But I think that there needs to be more oversight, I think that by not having a governing board, you need to resolve that so that we feel like we have a little bit more understanding of what's going on. I do appreciate the emails and the invites and all that stuff like that.

David Moore:

Thank you very much.

Robert Baldwin:

If I might add that the governing board is basically just a sounding box, I mean another words we have planning team meetings about every other month and which all the players and everybody on the governing board participates in those except you (Savino) includes Jimmy from Game and Fish and all the other partners and stuff so that's going on all the time. As far as overseeing the events and the manual criteria and all that other stuff. So, the governing board is basically to report to about the status of the program and if we have significant changes that need to be done either in a manual as far as procedures or eligibility of people or whatever. To change those manual stuff if it's significant then yes, take it to the governing council.

John Savino:

Is OVHAG receiving an invite to this planning meeting as you call them?

Chris Gammage:

No, we are not part of that.

Robert Baldwin:

Yes you are. I have sent you meeting, planning meeting stuff. I have sent you.. Like when Don said, "why am I getting invited to this," you know I.

Don French:

I didn't know what it was.

Robert Baldwin:

Anytime we have a planning meeting they are usually on a Wednesday afternoon, like I said they are like every other month and you can call in, we have a call in thing. If you want to participate in that you are more than welcome. Because again it's all the players

that we try to get together, people from Prescott now, we have people from Flagstaff and all that going on so...

John Savino:

Maybe that's the whole thing that is maybe is that if hindsight or future sight or maybe one of the advisory group members if they sat on that group, then the way it seems right now when we did this and we said okay, John, they elected me, and they just pointed at me and said John, you are our representative on the governing board three years ago and I've been to one meeting what that looks like is, hey they are running amuck and they aren't involving, they aren't getting any input from the advisory group from this stuff? Now I hear one of the reasons why it makes sense is that why have the doggone thing if everybody else is coming to these other meetings then it would make sense if I were, and I say I don't want to go, I'll assign it to somebody else. But if one of our members were going to one of those regular planning meetings then going then the governing thing would make sense and to only have that when you have a specific issue that you need covered. So, that makes a lot of sense to me.

Robert Baldwin:

If read the MOU basically that's what it says is that the governing council will meet once a year and have oversight, but the planning team is the working group that makes things happen. Yet again when the program was first set up, Amy and Troy were the governing council for the oversight and now that's expanded with the agency involvement, and volunteer involvement and other partners we are all just working together just trying to identify the issues and trying to resolve problems and I want to point out, I don't know if you have seen any of the emails from Marge recently, but she has done an outstanding job of reaching out in some very critical areas for community involvement and may actually get some groups together that really represent the entire community. Particularly in Payson, she has a meeting next week, for a couple of weeks.

Marge Dwyer:

On the 30th.

Robert Baldwin:

To get together with people in that area to see how they want to support, what they think the program can do to not only resolve some of the issues with the forest service up there as far as regulated views but to also make it up to community, a focus on community economy. To invite people up for responsible recreation and make money doing it, that's happening there and also in Wickenburg with a group out of there. And she has been up to Havasu City and last week to.

Marge Dwyer:

I'm sorry.

Don French:

You went to Havasu City last week? How did that go?

Marge Dwyer:

How did that go? We had 4 clubs. Correct? We had 4 clubs represented; we think that the Havasu 4 wheelers were really excited and really want to take the lead on getting something going. What we saw was when the agency are ready to get their trail

manager plans, trail manager rules out, then they start realizing that they really need the help. Correct? From people who know what the trails look like. Right? And where the trails should be so, then they are very interested in having the Ambassador program for a number of reasons. First of all we are of neutral party, We are not the agencies, so we can take it when people are yelling at us and concerned about what's closing and we've done that. And we try to explain it as best as we can as a neutral party as to why things are the way that they are and we have a briefing with the agencies and helping people understand what's going to happen trails and new trail management plans. This is significant part of what we can do we do it very well and we have been doing it up in the Coconino in just six weeks or so we have talked to over 500 people about the trails, helped them understand the maps, helped 100s understand why they can go in certain areas and those kinds of things. So that is what the Colorado River District sees us as doing and that's what we're doing in the middle of Gila. Educating the public as to where they can ride now and why. Now the next thing that we do as these TMRs and TMPs are phased in is help these agencies getting these kiosks up, and the signs up, for example I did inventory in the middle of Gila, again this is where it got to hot, it was 106 in no air conditioning, we inventoried again to see what trails were actually being used as it related to the original inventory that was done in 2003 and I went with a group of Ambassadors that were very knowledgeable about where sign in areas should go and where staging areas should go and we gave a whole set of recommendations back to the Tucson field office. We'll continue our inventory in the fall when it gets a little cooler, and we are a good third done with it and they're going to listen to us. Because, they want to know where are the best places to have the signs and the staging areas, and etc. to help the rider. So that's just a thumbnail of what the Ambassador program can do and helping the agencies and the riders.

Pete Pfeifer:

Yeah we need exactly what you are describing, because public meetings are so far and few between. You know people get all confused and panicky and you guys are seeing them a lot more on a regular basis.

Marge Dwyer:

On the ground, right where their riding. As a matter of fact Colorado River District asked me to send them samples of some of the things that Coconino and Tyack used to help the public understand what was going to happen and I also sent her a whole list of things that she needed to do including get a group of stake holders together in the community so that they can tell the agency what are the questions that the public wants to know and get them out on your website and have a point of contact and answer some questions immediately. So, they're listening and we are the conduit for that, we are the neutral third party and we are helping that whole aspect along.

Pete Pfeifer:

Good Job! We'll need it down at the Coronado, so that's beautiful.

Marge Dwyer:

I'm sorry that was a long degression but it gives you a thumbnail view of what we are doing.

John Savino:

Do you have anything else?

Pete Pfeifer:

Nope.

John Savino:

Are there any other measures? Okay, thank you very much.

Marge Dwyer:

You are very welcome.

John Savino:

I appreciate all of your hard work and where we've gotten so far with the Ambassador Program.

Chris Gammage:

I will add you guys to the planning team email. So, you guys can call in if you want to listen.

H. ADJOURNMENT – 2:55 pm

John Savino:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion for adjournment

David Moore:

The motion is yours.

John Savino:

Do I have a second? Don French. So all those in favor.

Group:

Aye.